DOCUMENTS EXPEDITING PROJECT

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1960

For release January 2, 1961

FOR RELEASE
JAN 2 1961
PLEASE GUARD AGAINST PREMATURE RELEASE

Prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
62224 WASHINGTON : 1960

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, Chairman

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri	DONALD L. JACKSON, California
CLYDE DOYLE, California	GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio
EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana	WILLIAM E. MILLER, New York
WILLIAM M. TUCK, Virginia	AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Michigan

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	1
Chapter I. Mob Violence as a Communist Weapon	3
Chapter II. Hearings:	
Air Reserve Center Training Manual	37
Communist Training Operations (Communist Activities and Propaganda Among Youth Groups), Parts 2 and 3	40
Communist Espionage in the United States	51
The Northern California District of the Communist Party: Structure—Objectives—Leadership, Parts 1–4	55
Communist Activities Among Seamen and on Waterfront Facilities, Part 1	64
Communist Penetration of Radio Facilities (Conelrad—Communications), Part 1	70
Testimony of Captain Nikolai Fedorovich Artamonov	73
National Security Agency	75
Chapter III. Reports:	
Communist Target—Youth: Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics	77
The Communist-Led Riots Against the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco, Calif., May 12–14, 1960	82
World Communist Movement: Selective Chronology 1818–1957, Vol. I, 1818–1945	88
Facts on Communism: Vol II—The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev	90
Chapter IV. Consultations:	
The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 5	95
Mr. Joseph Pauco, Father Theodoric Joseph Zubek, Mr. Nuci Kotta, and Mr. Arshi Pipa	
The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 6	98
Mr. Rusi Nasar, Mr. Ergacsh Schermatoglu, Mr. Constant Mierlak, Dr. Vitaut Tumash, and Mr. Anton Shukeloyts	
The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 7	100
Mr. Guivy Zaldastani, Mr. George Nakashidse, Mr. Dimitar K. Petkoff, and Mrs. Catherine Boyan Choukanoff	
Lest We Forget!: A Pictorial Summary of Communism in Action	103
Mr. Klaus Samuli Gunnar Romppanen	
Soviet "Justice": "Showplace" Prisons vs. Real Slave Labor Camps	104
Mr. Adam Joseph Galinski	
Communist Economic Warfare	107
Dr. Robert Loring Allen	
How the Chinese Reds Hoodwink Visiting Foreigners	110
Mr. Robert Loh	
Chapter V. Publications	113
Chapter VI. Reference Service	115
Chapter VII. Contempt Proceedings	117
Chapter VIII. Legislative Recommendations	121
Index	i

CONTENTS

Page

Foreword 1

Chapter I. Myth Violence as a Communist Weapon 3

Chapter II. Doctrine.

Air Reserve Center Training Manual 37

Communist Training Operations (Communist Activities and Propaganda Among Young People (Camps), Parts 2 and 3 40

Communist Explosives in the United States 51

The Northern California District of the Communist Party: Structure—Objectives—Leadership, Parts 1–4 55

Communist Activities Among Seamen and on Waterfront Facilities, Part 1 61

Communist Penetration of Radio Facilities (Concord—Communications (June), 1951) 70

Testimony of Captain Nicolai Fedotov 73

National Security Agency 75

Chapter III. Unrest.

Communist Target—Youth: Communist Infiltration and Agitation Techniques 77

The Communist-Led Riots Against the Diem Government in Vietnam 82

American Activities in San Francisco, Calif., May 12–14, 1960 89

World Communist Movement: Selective Chronology 1818–1957, Vol. I, 1818–1945 89

Reds on Campus: Vol II—The Soviet Cabal, From Lenin to Khrushchev 91

Chapter IV. Communications.

The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 6 97

Mr. Joseph Pinto, Father Theodore Joseph Zadeh, Mr. Neal Gorin, and Mr. Azad Teja

The Crimes of Khrushchev, Parts 8 99

Mr. Rael Nasar, Mr. Ernest Sedgwick, Mr. Constant Merlak, Dr. Vikas Tumash, and Mr. Anton Gudanov

The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 7 100

Mr. Cuny Zaldarriaga, Mr. Diego Vela-Soto, Mr. Dimitar K. Petrov, and Mrs. Catherine Hoa as Communist

Last Days of Pompeii: A Pictorial Summary of Communism in Action 103

Mr. Klaus Sarauf Grunow Bonnyclaire

Soviet "Justice"; "Showplace" Prisons vs. Real Slave Labor Camps 104

Mr. Adam Joseph Galinski

Communist Espionage Warfare 107

Dr. Robert Loring Allen

How the Chinese Reds Brainwash Visiting Foreigners 110

Mr. Robert Loh

Chapter V. Publications 113

Chapter VI. Reference Service 115

Chapter VII. Contempt Proceedings 117

Chapter VIII. Legislative Recommendations 121

Index I

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946]; 60 Stat. 812, which provides:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * *

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * * * *

RULE XII

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 86TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 7, January 7, 1959

* * * * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress,

* * * * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

* * * * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

18. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * * * *

26. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

FOREWORD

Events of the past year have provided convincing evidence that the American people cannot rely completely on this country's armed forces to protect themselves from Communist domination and slavery. This is not because our military forces lack the power or the will to defend this country, but rather because the nature of the attacks being made on the United States by its major and only significant enemy are so designed as to render conventional military forces as ineffective as possible for defense purposes.

The Armed Forces of the United States are trained and equipped to directly engage and defeat the military forces of this country's enemies on the field of battle, on the high seas, undersea, and in the air. They have no role or, at best, a relatively insignificant one in nonmilitary, unconventional, or political warfare. In these fields of warfare, it is the civilian government and population that must bear the major part of the burden of waging both defensive and offensive operations against the attacks of the enemy.

In the foreword to the committee's "Annual Report for the Year 1959" I stressed the fact that, though the vital importance of massive military strength must not be underrated, the most urgent need of the free world was thorough understanding of communism—its doctrine, designs, strategy, and tactics. It is my belief that this has been verified by events of the past year. During this period it has been not so much military power, but rather knowledge of communism's greatly varied and effective methods of subversion—which knowledge makes possible preventive measures and plans of effective counterattack—that has been this country's most needed and important weapon.

Rioting, mob violence, and other disturbances have registered significant gains for world communism and a corresponding weakening in the free world's position in Asia, Africa, and Latin America during the past few years. Civilian-clothed mobs were Moscow's weapon in these battles which, in many cases, resulted in Communist advances. Even if it had been the desire of the United States (which it surely was not) to intervene militarily on the side of stability, freedom, and the strengthening of resistance to Red tyranny in these incidents, it would have been politically impossible to do so.

Communist power has grown on the home front, as well as in foreign lands. The Communist Party has not only recruited additional members but many unwitting assistants. The number of Americans who will turn out today in support of an organization whose aim, in effect, is to strip the United States of its most powerful deterrent military weapon is highly disturbing. The number who, at Communist instigation, have resorted to violence in an effort to prevent a committee of the Congress from conducting its proper business is equally disturbing. Such enemy forces—for they are that, whether they realize it or not—cannot be defeated with military weapons.

The masters in the Kremlin, in attempting to circumvent conventional military forces as they have in recent years, have thrown a direct challenge to the Congress and every citizen of this country to come to the defense of the United States by serving as combatants in this unconventional warfare. If they do not accept this challenge, this country will, on all fronts, suffer a series of defeats, such as it suffered on the international front during the past year.

Not only knowledge of communism, but the will to meet it and defeat it on every issue, domestic and foreign, is today vital to the preservation of the United States as a free country. The Congress cannot "let the Executive do it" and the people cannot remain on the sidelines with the feeling that the Executive and the Congress alone can win their battles for them. This battle is being waged not only on the floor of the Congress, in the conference rooms of the State Department, and in foreign lands, but also on the streets of New York and St. Louis, in high schools and colleges throughout the country, in political campaigns, in the press—in practically every phase of American life.

In the past, the American people have never backed away from a challenge to their continued existence as free men. Such challenges in the past, however, have been purely military in nature and relatively easy to perceive. The present challenge is disguised and primarily nonmilitary in nature.

For this reason, it is a greater and more dangerous challenge than any the American people have faced before. It will require study, dedication, intelligence, patriotism—day-to-day good citizenship—on the part of millions of Americans to meet it successfully.

The Committee on Un-American Activities in this Report for the Year 1960, presents some of the major aspects of this challenge and, through them, the basis for a sound approach for meeting it successfully.

FRANCIS E. WALTER, *Chairman.*

ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1960

CHAPTER I

MOB VIOLENCE AS A COMMUNIST WEAPON

Rioting and mob violence took place in San Francisco last May during the course of committee hearings in that city. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, in a report prepared for and released by the committee,[1] stated that the U.S. Communist Party, Northern California District, had planned and precipitated the violence.

Mr. Hoover's charge was denied by most of the non-Communists who took part in the rioting. Officially, the Communist Party maintained a discreet silence on this subject. Unofficially, its West Coast mouthpiece, the People's World, adopted a typically Communist position on the matter. Using the big lie and "Stop thief!" technique, it charged that the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the San Francisco police were the parties responsible for the violence, while—in practically the same breath—it raised the question of Communist Party responsibility and indirectly admitted party guilt.

As long ago as February 1957, however, many U.S. newspapers published accounts which also seemed to contradict Mr. Hoover's charge. They reported that the U.S. Communist Party had rejected force and violence as a means of achieving its ends. One eastern metropolitan daily, for example, broke this "news" to its reading public under the following headline:

"U.S. Reds Renounce Violence and Spying"

The evidence presented in Mr. Hoover's report, however, as well as additional evidence the committee has obtained, is so overwhelming that there can be no doubt that the mob rioting in San Francisco was engineered by the Communist Party.

The simple recitation of these facts, however, raises a number of questions:

Has the U.S. Communist Party, as reported, actually rejected force and violence as a weapon?

If so, was the rioting in San Francisco a violation of official U.S. Communist Party doctrine and discipline?

If not, can the American people expect more Communist-instigated riots of this kind in the future?

---

[1] "Communist Target—Youth: Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics," released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, July 18, 1960.

Communist Fraudulent Rejection of Violence

The constitution of the U.S. Communist Party, adopted at its 16th National Convention in February 1957, contains the following clause:

> Subject to the provisions of this Article, any member shall be expelled from the Party who * * * advocates force and violence or terrorism * * *. (Article VII, Section 2)

The 1948 Communist Party constitution, which the 1957 constitution superseded, contained a very similarly worded clause:

> Any member shall be expelled from the Party who * * * advocates force and violence or terrorism * * *. (Article VIII, Section 3)

The 1948 constitution was an amendment of the constitution adopted by the party in 1945, which *did not state* that advocacy of force and violence would be punished by expulsion from the party. The 1945 constitution, however, like the 1948 and 1957 constitutions, did call for the "immediate expulsion" of any member who adhered to, or participated in, the activities of any group "which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken or overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy."

The fraudulent nature of these anti-violence and anti-conspiracy provisions in the 1945 and 1948 Communist Party constitutions has been thoroughly exposed by the United States Government. Since 1949, 109 leaders of the Communist Party have been convicted under the Smith Act, in courts of original jurisdiction, for *conspiring* to advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by *force* and *violence*, or for being knowing members of an organization advocating such overthrow—all of them for acts committed *since 1945*.

The inclusion of a "no force and violence" clause in the 1948 Communist Party constitution, following the absence of one in the 1945 constitution, was clearly a window-dressing act inspired by ulterior motives on the part of the Communist Party. The 12 top leaders of the party had been indicted under the Smith Act on July 20, 1948. The party adopted its new constitution on August 6, 1948—just 17 days later. When the official party publication, The Worker, published the text of this new constitution on October 3, 1948, it appeared under the following headline:

"This Document Refutes Frame-up of 'Twelve' "

"Communist Party Constitution Gives Lie to Force and Violence Charge"

Preceding the text of the new constitution was a statement which read, in part, as follows:

> This document shatters the lies and frame-up charges leveled against the Communists by the Truman administration and the press, by Dewey and the Un-Americans.
>
> Every thinking American should read this basic Communist document. And judge for himself.

On its face, this was blatant self-serving party propaganda. Legalistically, the adoption of the expulsion-for-violence provision was

an attempt on the part of the party to create "documentary proof" that could be used in the trial of its 12 top leaders to help them escape conviction for their crimes.

This self-evident device failed. Twelve thinking Americans *did* read this basic Communist document, as the party requested, listened to the evidence presented in the trial of the "Twelve"—and found the 12 guilty of conspiring to advocate violent overthrow of the United States Government. The jurors' verdict was upheld by the courts.

Since that first trial involving members of the Communist Party's National Committee, hundreds of American jurors have read the 1948 constitution of the Communist Party, listened to the evidence against 98 additional Communist Party leaders, and found them guilty of advocating violence—despite the previously quoted anti-violence provision in the Communist Party constitution.

Not one of the Communist Party leaders convicted under the Smith Act has been expelled from the party for believing in violence or for conspiratorial *acts* designed to promote the violent overthrow of this Government.

On the contrary, all of these leaders, through their convictions, have become party heroes and have had more honors and tributes heaped on them than they had ever received before.

At the 1957 "anti-violence" and "anti-conspiracy" convention, twenty party leaders were elected to the Communist Party's new National Committee. Fifteen of the twenty—75% of them—had been indicted under the Smith Act. One of the fifteen had escaped trial for reasons of health. The other fourteen had all been convicted in courts of original jurisdiction. Eight had served prison terms—and emerged unrepentant—following their convictions. The other six, as a result of Supreme Court decisions, had had their convictions reversed.

These facts alone are evidence that no credence whatsoever can be placed in any Communist Party constitutional provision against belief in, or advocacy or use of, force and violence.

No Communist Party leaders have been tried under the Smith Act since the adoption of the February 1957 Communist Party constitution (the last Smith Act indictment was on May 29, 1956) but, on the basis of past and present evidence, there is every reason to believe that the 1957 Communist Party constitution is as fraudulent as those of 1948 and 1945 in "outlawing" belief in, or use of, force and violence or participation in conspiratorial activity by party members.

When the Communist Party adopted its 1957 constitution, it was as anxious to deceive the American public about its real nature and beliefs as it had been in 1945 and 1948. In the 7 years that had passed since its last convention, the party had experienced one of the worst periods in its history. According to FBI statistics, the party had lost approximately 35,000 members in this period, 3,000 of them in the last year.

During this period, Smith Act trials had placed a significant number of the party's key leaders in prison and had thoroughly exposed the party itself as a conspiracy operating outside the law and in a completely un-American fashion. The party's openly adopted position on the Korean War had branded it as a party of treason. The party had been forced to operate almost completely underground. It had also been torn by internal bickering and strife.

Now—in 1957—it was attempting a comeback. It believed conditions had changed sufficiently for it to come out into the open again, at least as far as holding a convention was concerned.

It also realized, however, that if it was to make any progress toward recouping its losses, it had to make a tremendous effort to convince the American people that it had really changed, that it was no longer tied to Moscow's apron strings, and that it did not believe in using force and violence. Its primary aim—and need—was to put on a cloak of decency and respectability, to appear democratic, law-abiding, 100% American—and also, of course, to again provide itself with a legalistic, constitutional defense against further Smith Act prosecutions, particularly since the same old tried and true, hard-core conspirators were still ruling the organization.

It was for this reason that the anti-violence and anti-conspiracy provisions were inserted in the new 1957 constitution—along with pious-sounding, "thoroughly American" statements such as the following:

> We [Communists] advocate a peaceful, democratic road to socialism * * * within the developing constitutional process.
>
> The Communist Party * * * defends the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights * * *.
>
> In the struggle for democracy, peace and social progress, the Communist Party strives to carry forward the democratic traditions * * *.

Article II, Section 1, of the 1957 constitution declared:

> The purposes of this organization [the Communist Party] are: through the exercise of democratic and constitutional rights and participation in the electoral process and other forms of political activity, to promote the welfare of the working people of the United States * * *.

Unfortunately for the cause of truth and freedom, various communications media in the United States reported these professed declarations of Communist belief and aims to the public as genuine.

The True Communist Doctrine on Force and Violence

The official—and real—Communist Party position on the question of force and violence has been stated hundreds of times by top party officials and theorists in all parts of the world. The last major occasion on which it was pronounced openly and forcefully by the high mogul of world communism, Nikita S. Khrushchev, was at the spectacular 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, held in Moscow in February 1956.

It was the Soviet dictator's self-serving, knife-in-the-back attack on the dead Stalin at this congress which made the big headlines and caused endless discussion in the non-Communist world. But it was actually Khrushchev's pronouncements on fundamental Communist doctrines and policies—which were for the most part ignored or erroneously reported in the United States—that held most significance for non-Communist nations.

Speaking on the question of force and violence in his February 14 address to that congress, Khrushchev laid down a line in reference to

the United States that was actually tougher than some previous Communist teachings. He stated:

> The enemies are fond of depicting us, Leninists, as supporters of violence *always* and in all circumstances. It is *true* that we recognize the *necessity* for the *revolutionary transformation* of capitalist society into Socialist society.
>
> This is what distinguishes revolutionary Marxists from reformists and opportunists. There is *not a shadow of doubt* that for a number of capitalist countries the overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship *by force* and the connected sharp aggravation of class struggle is *inevitable.* * * *
>
> Leninism teaches us that the ruling classes will not relinquish power of their own free will.
>
> * * * the use or not of force in the transition to socialism, depends not so much on the proletariat as on the extent of the resistance put up by the exploiters, and on the employment of violence by the exploiting class itself * * *.
>
> Of course, in countries where capitalism is still strong and where it controls an enormous military and police machine, *the serious resistance of the reactionary forces is inevitable.*
>
> Then the transition to socialism will proceed *amid conditions of an acute class revolutionary struggle.*[1] (Emphasis added.)

For years Communist propagandists have made it clear that in Moscow's view the United States of America is, in today's world, the prime example of a nation "where capitalism is still strong and where it controls an enormous military and police machine." Khrushchev's doctrine, therefore, is that "there is not a shadow of doubt" but that the Communists can seize power in the U.S. *only* "amid conditions of an acute class revolutionary struggle," i.e., by force and violence as opposed to peaceful means.

This is, in a sense, a reversal of one of Marx's teachings. In 1872, speaking on the methods by which Communists could achieve control in different nations, Marx said—

> the institutions, customs, and traditions of the separate countries have to be taken into account; and we do not deny that there are countries like America and Britain * * * in which the workers can achieve their goal by peaceful means.

Marx believed, and taught, that though Communists would have to use force and violence to gain control in most countries, there was a good chance that they would be able to gain power in the U.S. by peaceful means.

Khrushchev now states very much the opposite—that the Communists may succeed in seizing power peacefully in some other countries but that there is *no chance* of doing so in the U.S. where "the serious resistance of the reactionary forces is inevitable" and "an acute class revolutionary struggle" is, therefore, also inevitable.

---

[1] Difficult as it is to believe after reading these words, many accounts of Khrushchev's speech reported that, because he had also mentioned the *possibility* of Communists seizing power by peaceful means in some countries, he had rejected force and violence as a means of conquest.

In 1948, this committee published a 160-page "Report on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence." This report, containing scores of quotations from the Communist classics, from the statements of Soviet and U.S. Communist Party leaders, and from Communist publications in all parts of the world proved conclusively that belief in, and advocacy of, force and violence were integral parts of the Communist ideology.

The 1960 Moscow Manifesto

In November 1960 representatives of 81 Communist parties from every quarter of the globe met in Moscow for a high-level conference that lasted several weeks. At its conclusion, a 20,000-word manifesto on Communist doctrine, strategy, and tactics was issued. According to its own statement, this manifesto *is binding on all Communist parties.* The manifesto openly stated the Communists' belief in violence as a means of seizing power:

> The forms and course of development of the Socialist revolution will depend on . . . the extent of the resistance put up by the ruling classes. * * *
>
> Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class, headed by its vanguard [the Communist Party], has the opportunity . . . to . . . win state power without civil war * * *.
>
> All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle * * * .
>
> In the event of the exploiting classes' resorting to violence . . . the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. *Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily.* In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend . . . on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles . . . on these circles using force * * *. (Emphasis added.)

Stripped of its Communist Aesopian language or double talk and translated realistically into everyday English, the above quotation—the latest official statement of the Communist doctrine on force and violence, binding on the U.S. Communist Party—would read as follows:

> We Communists may be able to seize power in some countries by nonviolent means. Leninism teaches us, however—and history confirms this—that, even when the Communist minority demands it, non-Communist peoples will *never* accept Communist slavery without resistance. In such cases, we will have to use force and violence to impose communism on them

The U.S. Communist Party Line

Since the 1948 Smith Act indictment of its leaders, for reasons that are readily understandable, the Communist Party in the U.S. has soft-pedaled its force-and-violence doctrine. At the same time however—particularly in the last year or so—it has gone as far as it dare

go in openly reminding members of the conspiracy that force and violence is a weapon they must be prepared to use.

Some examples:

The conspiracy's monthly publication, Political Affairs, in its issue of June 1960, published an article entitled "Recovery After the Anti-Revisionist Struggle."[1] This article was actually the text of a contribution made by party leader James S. Allen to a discussion held by the party's National Committee at a meeting in Chicago last March.

Allen rejoiced in this article that "the latest revisionist attack inside the Party has been defeated." He said that, with changed conditions, there was a need to overcome "the indecisions and fears" which had recently kept the party from moving boldly forward.

Allen denounced as the kernel of wrong thinking within the party in the postwar era the erroneous revisionist idea, rejected by the party, that—

> extended peaceful co-existence would mean the suspension of the class struggle on a world scale and at home.

He declaimed against the argument of the revisionists that—

> since peace is assured by the basic shift in world relations, we can now have an evolution to socialism through the collaboration of classes within the country and on a world scale. * * *
>
> If we were to follow the advice of rightists we would take a permanent vacation from the class struggle * * *.

He next made reference to the views of the left deviationists within the Communist movement and what was wrong with them. He then summarized his criticism of both the right and left deviationists in the following words:

> Both see the turn [toward Communist victory in world affairs] as practically finished, and they also see it as pure—without the conflicts, struggles and contradictions in the situation. The 17th Convention rejected this lopsided interpretation.

He asserted that the Marxist-Leninist laws which make peaceful coexistence possible today—

> are expressed in class and social struggles * * * are not cancelled out by peaceful relations among governments * * * history still moves forward through the contradiction and conflict of class and social forces.
>
> Therefore, the revisionists were incorrect when they held that * * * the fight for peace required policies directed toward class collaboration. The party is entirely correct * * * in recognizing as characteristic of this period in our country *the growing acuteness of the class struggle.* (Emphasis added.)

The "class struggle," in Communist parlance, means the Communists' unending fight to impose their dictatorship, using all kinds

[1] "Revisionism," in Communist jargon, means deviation from correct policy or doctrine along rightist, conservative or "soft" lines.

of weapons, violent and nonviolent—everything from a speech or the distribution of a pamphlet to an armed uprising.

When Khrushchev spoke of an "acute class revolutionary struggle" in his 20th Congress speech, however, he was making a clear-cut, if somewhat veiled, reference to force and violence—armed revolution.

Though Allen did not use the phrase "force and violence" once in his article quoted above, his statement that the present period in the United States is one of "growing acuteness of the class struggle," taken in its over-all context, is an indication that, in the present period, Communists are to use their more violent forms of struggle against the Government.

It is significant that Allen made his remarks emphasizing the "growing acuteness of the class struggle" to a meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party in March 1960, that the Communist-instigated violence in San Francisco took place just 2 months later, and that party boss Gus Hall subsequently congratulated the California party members for the good job they had done in staging the riot.[1]

In its issue of October 1960, Political Affairs followed up Allen's somewhat veiled references to the force-and-violence doctrine by reprinting an article written by two Soviet theoreticians, F. Konstantinov and K. Momdzhan, which had been published in the "Kommunist" (Moscow) in July 1960. The article was entitled "Dialectics and Our Time." In it the two Soviet theoreticians touched much more openly on the question of force and violence. For this reason, the re-publication of their article in a U.S. Communist Party periodical is particularly significant. Excerpts from the article follow:

> One of the most important questions agitating mankind today is the question of the ways and forms of transition from capitalism to socialism. . . . But what are the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism in our time? Is this transition connected in all cases with armed insurrection and civil war? * * *
>
> "The forms of transition from capitalism to socialism in different countries may vary," says the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties * * *.
>
> "In the existing situation, in some of the capitalist countries the working class headed by its foremost detachment has the possibility of . . . conquering state power without civil war * * *."
>
> At the same time *it should be emphasized* that the theses of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties on the forms of transition of different countries to socialism did not proclaim a peaceful transition as the only possibility. On the contrary, the Congress noted that *in some capitalist countries, where the military and police apparatus of the monopolistic bourgeoisie is strong*, it is necessary to be prepared for attempts on the part of the latter to suppress the will of the people by force and thus compel them to resort to *the sharpest forms of the class struggle.* * * *

[1] *See* p. 9 of report "Communist Target—Youth."

> And so, the working class and its parties should acquire command of *all the means and forms of struggle.* (Emphasis added.)

The appearance of this article in Political Affairs was a clear-cut directive to U.S. party members that they particularly must become expert in, and be prepared to use, force and violence, "the sharpest forms of the class struggle."

According to testimony of former high-ranking Communist Party leaders, the party press is used in various ways as a directive for members of the conspiracy. Not only editorials but feature articles and so-called straight news accounts are utilized by the party to convey to its members the line, strategy, and tactics that are to be used in any given period or situation.

An analysis of the U.S. Communist Party press reveals that, in this respect, it has frequently reminded its members of the force-and-violence doctrine in the past year by providing them with many models to emulate.

E.g., Fidel Castro seized power and established a Communist-controlled government in Cuba by armed revolution. The U.S. Communist press has devoted more space to the Red Cuban revolution than to any other foreign development during the past year or so. Its treatment of Castro, his lieutenants, and the revolution has been consistently laudatory. Two examples will suffice to show the manner in which the party has used the Cuban revolution to convey to its members an approving message on the use of force and violence:

1. The Worker of August 14, 1960, gave three-column coverage to the address which Major Ernesto "Che" Guevara, the fiery Cuban Communist leader, had delivered to the Latin American Youth Congress in Havana on July 26. "Che" Guevara closed this address, The Worker noted, by saying that Cuba would be very happy if every delegate to the Youth Congress, upon returning to his country, would say:

> Here we are, the word is coming to us fresh from the Cuban forests . . . We went up to the Sierra Maestra, we saw the dawn of better days and we have in our minds and our hands the seeds of the dawn and we are ready to sow them in our land.

2. The United States Communist Party sent an unofficial delegation to the 8th National Assembly of the Popular Socialist (Communist) Party of Cuba which was held in Havana, August 16–21, 1960. The delegation was headed by James E. Jackson, a member of the party's National Secretariat.

Both The Worker of September 11 and the September 1960 issue of Political Affairs published the full text of the speech Jackson delivered at the gathering of Cuban Communists. In it he brought "hearty congratulations" from the U.S. Communist Party and praised the Cuban Popular Socialist Party (PSP) as "the party of selfless loyalty and exemplary service to the people's revolutionary cause." He referred to the "glorious achievements of the Cuban revolution" and said that the U.S. Communist Party—

> is inspired by the great work of the heroic PSP * * *. In theory and in practice it is blazing new trails * * *.

62224—60——2

> You can be sure, comrades, that the Communist Party of the United States will fullfill its obligations of international solidarity with the Cuban revolution, overcoming all difficulties that may be raised against us, come what may! * * *
>
> Long live the Popular Socialist Party which lives by, and carries forward, the all-conquering banner of Marxism—Leninism!

During the past year, the world has been torn by Communist-led and Communist-instigated violence and riots in which many persons have been killed and injured. They have taken place in Mexico, Venezuela, France, Turkey, Morocco, Italy, Japan, Guatemala, Uruguay, Algeria, and numerous other countries. Both the U.S. Communist and Soviet press have endorsed these violent demonstrations in instance after instance.

Earlier this year the Communist Party of Italy called for demonstrations in some 500 cities to protest U.S. military bases in that country. A number of people were killed and many injured in the course of the rioting associated with these demonstrations. After this had happened, the official U.S. Communist Party newspaper, The Worker, featured an interview with Luigi Longo, vice-secretary of the Italian Communist Party. In answering a question about the Italian Communist Party's "Italian road to socialism" for the U.S. Communists, Longo claimed the Italian party hoped to achieve power peacefully, but then said:

> Of course, we do not exclude that this perspective of democratic development may be opposed or even prevented by violent acts of the most reactionary groups of the Italian bourgeoisie. We believe, however, that any attempt in this sense can be avoided if we will be able to create a wide alliance of popular forces capable of fighting our adversaries also by force, whenever they would resort to this attempt.

Armando Penha was an FBI undercover informant in the Communist Party from early 1950 until the spring of 1958. During this period he held key posts in the party—member of its National Textile Commission, section organizer, chairman of Regional Section Organizers Committee, party area chairman, and member of the New England District Committee of the Communist Party. Testifying before this committee on March 18, 1958, on the basis of his experience in the party, Penha stated:

> By and large the Communist Party knows—and I am speaking from experiences as resulted from top meetings that have been told to me—that the Communist Party will never at any given moment be able to convert the American public at large. They realize that. The only way is to make use of the tools that Lenin has handed down, mainly force and violence.

In a subsequent appearance before the committee on July 29, 1958, Penha testified as follows concerning the Communist Party's move underground in 1950—

> the party, by going underground, has been a party of hardcore, zealous, dedicated Communists, who have been trained for the ultimate purpose of the overthrow of this Government.

Communist Reaction to the San Francisco Riots

As previously mentioned, the Communist Party blamed the rioting in San Francisco on the Committee on Un-American Activities and the police of that city. The West Coast Communist Party newspaper, the People's World, featured a front-page editorial on the riots in its issue of May 21, 1960, which was entitled "From Blackmail to Blackjack." The editorial stated:

> The very arrival of the Committee was a deliberate provocation, an invitation to violence. It is of the essence of the Committee's operation that if it cannot dictate conformity with blackmail and the blacklist, then it will invoke the blackjack. * * * the police were acting as the violent armed agents of a committee that seeks to destroy * * * freedoms.

Touching on the charge of Communist instigation of the violence that broke out during the committee hearings, it stated:

> "But who inspired the students?" it is asked. And in some quarters there is the insinuation that they were inspired in some sinister manner by Communists.
>
> Whatever the Communist Party might have contributed to "inspiring" student opposition to the Un-American Committee it was only a small part of the vast upswell of inspiration.

Significantly, the People's World, though it had here provided itself with an opportunity to do so, did not flatly deny that the rioting students had been "inspired" by the Communist Party. On the contrary, it attempted to defend their resort to violence by proclaiming:

> They were rightly incensed when they found themselves excluded from the hearing room * * *.

The following week, Michael Gold devoted his regular column in the People's World to the subject of youth and its increasing participation in political activity in all parts of the world. He hailed the students of Korea whose rioting had brought about the downfall of President Syngman Rhee. In writing of the youthful rioters in San Francisco, he spoke of "the good will, the intelligence and public spirit of these youngsters" and their "great-hearted demonstration." In the closing sentence of his column, Gold openly expressed his approval of the rioters with these words:

> Now one could be sure of the future here. The "silent generation" was at last taking its rightful place in the vanguard of progress.

The San Francisco rioters also won the praise of Mason Roberson, another columnist for the party's official West Coast newspaper. His June 25, 1960, column was entitled "'Quiet' Youth Silent No More." Referring to the students who would be completing their college educations during the current month—the "Class of 1960"—Roberson wrote:

> What a record these young people have made! In a few brief months they've shaken and inspired the world with

> examples of struggles against injustice and the follies of their parents to warm the hearts of everyone who harbors hope for a better world.
>
> On a thousand campuses, in half a hundred countries, sometimes alone, often with the people many of whom had never seen the inside of a classroom, the voices rose.
>
> IN SAN FRANCISCO, they routed the Un-American Committee—a story too familiar to need further comment here. But that was only one wave in the storm. * * *
>
> And the spirit seems contagious. The rising tide of activity among American students is only part of a campaign sweeping the world. * * *
>
> There's a great new wind blowing through the schoolrooms. And it is full of hope for all mankind.

Revealingly, both Gold and Roberson tied the San Francisco riots in with the pattern of Communist-inspired riots which had recently taken place in many other countries of the world.

The Communist Party revealed its attitude toward the San Francisco rioters even in the so-called news items published in its press. The People's World of June 4, 1960, in an article about the Committee on Un-American Activities, referred with obvious approval to the San Francisco riots as "the latest—and, to date, most convincing—rebuff handed" to the committee. It also spoke approvingly of the rioters' "open mass defiance" of the committee during the hearings.

The same newspaper, in its issue of June 11, published a letter from one of its readers which stated, in part:

> Let us not regret that the House Un-American Committee met an unprecedented protest demonstration in our city. Let us not regret that the ranks of the demonstrators were swelled each day * * * by additional thousands of indignant Bay Area citizens, students and adults. Let us rather feel profound pride that the great American traditions of human dignity and human rights have found such confident, militant and peaceful [sic] expression in San Francisco.

"Campus rebels: test under fire" was the headline spread across the top of page one of the October 15 issue of People's World. A youth survey story written by party leader Al Richmond appeared under it. Richmond wrote at some length on the "morality" of the student rioters, said that when the police turned the fire hoses on them they had "performed a baptismal service," and referred approvingly to the old radical belief "about the educational value that lies at the end of a policeman's club."

The Worker of September 11, 1960, featured an interview with the Honorary Chairman of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster. Art Shields, one of the paper's regular correspondents, wrote that he and Michael Gold had recently visited Foster at his country home. The following excerpts from the Shields-Gold interview with Foster are further indications of the Communist Party's approval of mob violence—here in the United States—as a weapon for achieving its objectives:

> And he [Foster] laughed gaily when he saw Mike. They had not met since Mike went West four years ago. And Mike was back with good news.

MIKE'S GOOD NEWS

> Mike's good news was about the youth in San Francisco. * * * They seemed to have no political interests a year or two ago. But now they are active in every mass struggle.
>
> And Mike told how San Francisco's youths overwhelmed the witchhunters of the Un-American Activities Committee in three days of stirring demonstrations this spring. * * *
>
> This was music to Bill. He always tried to get young folks around him as a * * * Communist leader.

Such public statements in the official press of the Communist Party convey a much more accurate picture of the Communist view of force and violence than does the party constitution. They can leave no doubt in the mind of any reasonable person but that the U.S. Communist Party thoroughly approves of the mob violence its California agents instigated in San Francisco last May.

More Approval

On June 3, 1960, there was a meeting of an organization called the Youth Against the House Un-American Activities Committee [1] in the Woodstock Hotel, New York City. The purpose of the meeting was to protest and arouse opposition to this committee's forthcoming hearings on Communist infiltration of waterfront facilities and seamen's groups which were held in Washington on June 6, 7, 8, and 23, 1960.

The principal speaker at this affair was Frank Wilkinson, an identified member of the Communist Party who for the past several years has been serving as the conspiracy's chief field agent in its drive to bring about the abolition of this committee. Wilkinson, in his speech, allegedly gave his youthful audience a true picture of what happened in San Francisco. He praised and defended the student rioters. At one point in his speech he made the following statement:

> Well, these kids knew they were right, so that they sat down right at the top of the stairs, locked arms and sang "We Shall Not Be Moved!" [2] [Applause.] * * * They were there, and they did what they did to show that they didn't want the Committee and that they wouldn't be intimidated by either the police or the committee. [Applause.]

Another speaker at this meeting was Peter Goodman, who had been barred from serving as a seaman as a result of the Coast Guard security screening program. Goodman, subpenaed to testify before the committee in the hearings this meeting was called to protest—and identified as a member of the Communist Party in those hearings—invoked the fifth amendment on party membership and other matters when he testified several days later. In his address to the young people

---

[1] Subsequently cited by the committee as a Communist front. See p. 51 of this report. This organization has since changed its name to "Youth to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee" and, more recently, to "Youth to Abolish Un-American Committees."

[2] The words and music of this song, which was used extensively by sitdown strikers in the 1930's, appeared in "Songs of the People," a song book published by the Communist Party in that period. The third stanza reads:

> Lenin is our leader,
> We shall not be moved.

at the meeting in the Woodstock Hotel, he made the following statement:

> Congressman Walter will be a little better educated after next week is over. I have an idea that he's going to be a little sorry he called us, although after hearing what took place in San Francisco—with tongue in cheek—may we do as well.

A Miss Miller, who also spoke at the meeting and made the collection pitch, told her listeners at one point:

> When the House Un-American Activities Committee comes to New York, we have an obligation to at least show to San Francisco that we can do not as well, but 10 times as well, as they did. [Applause.]

At one point in her collection speech, she urged everyone in the audience to make some contribution—

> because we have to make sure we give 'em hell when they come to New York. [Applause.]

On May 26, 1960, Anthony Krchmarek appeared before the committee to testify under subpena. Krchmarek is a member of the party's National Committee and chairman of the Ohio Communist Party. The committee called him as a witness because, sometime earlier, Lt. Col. Frantisek Tisler, former military attaché of the Czech Embassy in Washington, D.C., after defecting from that post, had testified that Krchmarek had met with, and supplied information to, staff members of the Czech Embassy on many occasions and had also turned over information to the Czech ambassador. The Czech Embassy, in turn, Tisler had testified, had supplied money to Krchmarek for travel expenses and also to aid in his defense when he was tried under the Smith Act in 1955–56.[1]

Krchmarek, in citing a number of reasons why he would not answer many questions for the committee, gave the following as one of them:

> I think that the kind of a reception that the committee got in San Francisco is an indication of how the American people are beginning to feel and to react to the work of this committee.

These statements made by officials, rank-and-file members of the Communist Party and fellow travelers, like the previously quoted statements from the Communist press, are conclusive evidence that the Communist Party endorsed and rejoiced at the mob violence which took place in San Francisco.

More Communist-Led Riots in the Future?

It is clear from the foregoing that the Communist Party has not rejected force and violence as a weapon in its drive to establish a Communist government in the United States. It is also clear that the rioting in San Francisco, planned and set off by the Communist Party—as J. Edgar Hoover has repeatedly stated—was not a violation of Communist Party doctrine and discipline, but that, on the contrary, it has the wholehearted approval of the party.

---

[1] See pp. 51–53 for a more detailed synopsis of Tisler's testimony.

Now we come to the third question—that of whether or not more rioting of this type will take place in the United States in the immediate future.

There is no certain or simple answer to this question. It depends entirely on the *advisability* of violence in the United States *from the Communist viewpoint.*

Communists are trained, as military commanders are, to analyze all situations carefully before deciding just which weapons and tactics they will use in any given situation, at any given time, and in any given place.

Like military personnel, they are given a variety of weapons and tactics; trained in the use of each one of them; impressed with the idea that all are not to be used at once and that each has a special application; taught that they must be able to switch rapidly from the use of one weapon or tactic to another of an entirely different type; and indoctrinated with the idea that changing situations—on the international, national, and local level—call for changes in tactics and weapons.

In 1920, Lenin wrote:

> It is our duty as Communists to master all forms, to learn how to supplement with the maximum rapidity one form with another, to substitute one for another, and to adapt our tactics to every change that is called forth by something other than our class, or our efforts.

Stalin, in 1923, said:

> The strategy of the Party is not something permanent, fixed once and for all. It changes to meet historical shifts, historical turns . . . Naturally a strategic plan suitable for one historical period, possessing its peculiarities, cannot suit another historical period, possessing totally different peculiarities. Every historical turn has its strategic plan which corresponds to its requirements and is adapted to its tasks.

Again, in 1928, he wrote:

> The art of Bolshevik policy does not consist in any way in shooting indiscriminately from all cannon on all fronts, without taking into account the conditions of the time and place, without taking into account the readiness of the masses to support these or those steps of the leadership. The art of Bolshevik policy lies in the ability to choose the time and place and to take into consideration all the circumstances in the matter, so as to concentrate the fire on that front where it is possible first of all to obtain maximum results.

During a certain period, in a given country, should Communists openly defy law and order, or assume a guise of being completely law-abiding?

On the international level, should Moscow negotiate a "difference" with another nation or group of nations, or use force, blackmail, or some other weapon to resolve it?

Should Communists strike a particular plant, or a whole industry?

Should the strike be of short, or of long duration?

Should it be a sit-down strike, an orderly strike, or one marked by violence?

The Communists answer all such questions on the basis of strategy and tactics geared to the existing situation. Throughout their training they are indoctrinated with the idea that they are in a kind of perpetual combat, fighting endless day-by-day battles with related victories, stalemates, or defeats and that they should wage each battle and their over-all campaign as a military commander does—by carefully analyzing all factors affecting their struggle before deciding on a policy and plan of battle.

William Z. Foster, leader of the U.S. Communist Party for many years, provided a good example of this type of indoctrination when he wrote in the foreword of his 1926 booklet "Strike Strategy":

> Strike strategy varies widely from country to country and period to period. Its specific character depends upon the degree of economic development and of the sharpness of the class struggle in a given situation. The strike strategy necessary in a country in a revolutionary crisis differs very materially from that required in one with a flourishing and expanding capitalism.

After predicting that conditions in the United States would change greatly and that the Nation would be hit with serious economic crises that would turn the workers against capitalism, Foster continued:

> In the bitter struggles of that inevitable era the strike strategy will have to be quite different from and will be based upon a far more militant offensive than that possible in the workers' fight today.

In the previously quoted article "Dialectics and Our Time," the two Soviet theoreticians, F. Konstantinov and K. Momdzhan, emphasized the importance of tactics and fitting the weapon used to prevailing conditions. After telling the U.S. Communists and Communists in all parts of the world that they must "acquire command of all the means and forms of struggle," they went on to say:

> As for the specific means to be used, that depends upon the concrete conditions of struggle in each capitalist country. That is what materialist dialectics teaches us, in its application to the strategy and tactics of the struggle for socialism.

The question of Communist-instigated mob violence and rioting in the United States in the immediate future will be determined by the Communists' estimate of whether present tactical conditions call for the use of this weapon or of nonviolent methods.

There is considerable evidence that, in the United States, as well as on a world scale, the Communists feel that the present tactical situation calls for increased utilization of rioting and mob violence. A brief summary of party policy on mob violence in this country, in the light of varying tactical situations which have existed during the period from the end of World War II to the present time, will be helpful in understanding why, from the Communist view, the present situation calls for mob actions.

The 1935 Line—And 1960 Action

The true Communist attitude toward mob violence was spelled out clearly years ago, when the party was much more open and honest in speaking about the weapons it was prepared to use to achieve its ends.

In 1935, the U.S. Communist Party published a 72-page booklet entitled "Why Communism?" by M. J. Olgin, a member of the party's Central Committee. This booklet was used as a text in Communist Party schools, sold by the thousands in Communist book stores throughout the country, and used for study and indoctrination in party clubs and cell meetings.

In this pamphlet Olgin told the Communists that in the final revolution they must win the support of the armed forces—

> a revolution cannot win unless the armed forces, or at least *part of them*, join the workers. But once they join, the workers have not only rifles and cannon but also airships and poison gas and battleships to fight the bosses. * * * There is no reason why the workers should not use them against the enemy when the final conflict has arrived.

Under the immediately following subhead in his booklet, "The Question of Force and Violence," Olgin went on to say:

> "But this is force and violence," somebody will contend. "Don't you Communists know that the use of force and violence is wrong?" We reply to this, first, that if being a "red-blooded American" means anything, it means that you must not take punishment lying down, that you must offer resistance * * *. *When you go out on a demonstration in the open in front of a governmental office and the government sends the police and armed thugs to beat you up and disperse you, it is the government that is using force.* * * * To defy boss restrictions, to resist the attacks of the enemy class is just as natural for the working class as it is for a red-blooded human being not to take punishment lying down. * * *
>
> We Communists say the workers cannot have respect for boss law and boss morality directed against them. The class interests of the working class—these are the supreme law for the workers. * * *
>
> When you fight capitalism you are doing what is right and just and lawful from the point of view of your class interests and of the future of humanity. You are not "outlaws" the way the capitalist world brands revolutionary fighters. You are fighting for a higher morality and a higher law that will forever abolish exploitation—the morality and the law of the social revolution. (Emphasis added.)

The very same line expounded by Olgin in 1935 in the above passage was expounded in 1960 by the People's World, the West Coast voice of the Communist Party, in regard to the San Francisco riots.

A few pages farther on in his pamphlet, Olgin made a statement which described not only what the Communist Party was doing in his day, but also what it was to do 25 years later—in the city of San Francisco, on May 13, 1960:

> The Communist Party is active directly as an organization and indirectly through its members within other organizations. The Communist Party leads political as well as economic struggles * * * the fight against governmental terror [sic!] * * *. These fights are conducted through literature, through mass meetings, *through demonstrations, and, when occasion demands, through open mass combat with the police in the streets.* (Emphasis added.)

The Post World War II Era

In the immediate post World War II period, as a result of the wartime alliance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. against Hitler, the Soviet Union enjoyed an all-time high in prestige as far as the United States was concerned. This prestige rubbed off on the U.S. Communist Party because the people of this country—despite the dissolution of the Comintern in 1943, which allegedly marked the end of Moscow's control of national Communist parties—instinctively, and correctly, associated American Communists with the Kremlin.

The Communist Party itself was in good condition and had power far greater than its formal membership would indicate.

Television had not yet come into its own but, via the medium of radio, Communist agents were peddling the party line to millions of listeners as news commenators and analysts, and Communist radio writers were working the party line into dramatic shows and "documentaries."

Communists and fellow travelers were turning out large numbers of books on international affairs, many of which were being favorably reviewed in the most influential book review media and thus finding their way into numerous libraries and achieving best-seller status.

The theater, too, through the activities of certain Communist and fellow-traveling playwrights, lyricists, producers, and directors, was being used as a propaganda medium for the party line.

As later investigations were to reveal, the Hollywood film industry had been infiltrated by some three to four hundred party members who were actors, actresses, producers, directors, and film writers. Through the Conference of Studio Unions, the party almost succeeded in gaining control of the organized technicians in the film industry.

In the field of organized labor, the party had its "Mr. Big"—Lee Pressman—as general counsel of the CIO. Other members held key positions on the staff of the CIO News and used this paper, which went into the millions of workers' homes, for the spread of Communist propaganda. The party controlled a dozen key CIO unions, used their organs to spread pro-Communist propaganda, and had extensively infiltrated others. It had also succeeded to a lesser degree in infiltrating and influencing some AFL and independent unions.

The party also had its agents in Government, although the extent of this infiltration was not even faintly appreciated by the American public. (Under President Truman's loyalty program, during the 5-year period December 1947 to early 1953, 560 persons were dismissed

from Federal positions or denied employment, and an additional 6,828 persons who were under investigation either resigned their posts or withdrew their applications for employment with the Government.)

In summary, without going into further detail, the Communist Party was well entrenched in many of the major walks of life in this country. Through its secret agents it exercised great influence and power. To a considerable extent, it also was getting its own way.

During the first few years that followed the end of World War II, there were no Communist-led riots in the U.S. Tactically, they would have been wrong and foolish in view of existing conditions. The wisest policy for the party to follow during this period was to avoid any action that would tend to awaken the public to the true aims of the party, the extent of its power, and the success of its infiltration tactics—and thus arouse opposition to itself.

The Tide Begins to Turn

The years 1948–50 brought a great change in the fortunes of the U.S. Communist Party, a change effected by a number of factors. Stalin's takeover of a series of nations in Eastern Europe, the start of the "cold war," and the Red-fomented civil war in China awakened many U.S. citizens and Government officials to the real nature and aims of this country's "great" wartime ally. On the home front, the revelations of Louis Budenz, Whittaker Chambers, Elizabeth Bentley, and others had a similar effect. Within the CIO, a battle against the Communists began to shape up and led, in 1949–50, to the expulsion of those unions which persisted in following Moscow's line instead of official CIO policy. Similar developments took place in the educational, entertainment, and other fields.

The tide began to turn as the press, anti-Communist individuals and publications, and mass organizations launched information and action campaigns against communism, stimulated to a great extent by hearings and reports of congressional investigating committees.

During the initial phase of this period, the Communist Party was still strong, despite the indictment of its 12 top leaders in 1948, their trial and convictions in 1949, the convictions of the "Hollywood Ten," Hiss, Remington, Marzani, and others. Its morale, too, was strong because the U.S. party, like others, never considers itself as standing alone, but as a unit in a huge—and successful—international power complex.

Despite the opposition the U.S. Communist Party was running into at home, the Soviet Union had not been stopped. The civil war in China was running favorably for the Communists. In the few years that had passed since World War II ended, the territory and people controlled by the Kremlin had expanded tremendously. There was an obvious worldwide fear of Stalin. There was talk and fear of war—and war scares—in the free nations. As is usual in such times, there were strong differences of opinion in the ranks of the "enemy" as to whether firmness with, or appeasement of, Moscow was the better policy to follow. Unfortunatley, there were many people, even in Government, who still had not learned the true nature of either the Soviet Union, the U.S. Communist Party, or of Communists anywhere.

For this reason, the years 1949–50 were a period of militancy in the U.S. Communist Party. It was a period when it fought back vigorously against all measures—governmental or private—to expose its operations and curb its power. For the most part, it used nonviolent weapons but, when the situation seemed to call for it and the conspiracy saw gain in it, it did not hesitate to resort to mob violence—as in Peekskill, New York, in August 1949.

The Peekskill Riot

In the summer of 1949, the Communist Party planned a large outdoor concert in Peekskill, New York, a rural community about 40 miles north of New York City. Communist Party stalwart Paul Robeson was to be the star of the concert, as he had been at similar concerts in 1946, 1947, and 1948. The purpose of the concert was to raise funds for the Civil Rights Congress, the party's legal defense arm and bail-fund agency.

Veterans' groups in the town of Peekskill decided to stage a peaceful counter demonstration—a patriotic parade. The idea won overwhelming support in the town where anti-Communist sentiment, as in most parts of the United States, was increasing.

There was special reason for such sentiment in Peekskill. One of the largest summer camps run by the Communist Party in the United States was located some miles north of the town. There were Communist resorts and colonies located in other nearby areas, though there were few, if any, Communists in Peekskill itself. In a period when the Communists were becoming increasingly militant and openly offensive, the Communist activity apparent in the surrounding areas—and the annual concerts in Peekskill itself—had become more and more distasteful to the town's residents. Editorials and letters in the local press opposed the concert and urged support for the veterans' counter demonstration.

When the day of the concert and the protest parade arrived—August 27, 1949—about 5,000 anti-Communist marchers and onlookers turned out. The veterans' undertaking was so widely supported that the crowds jammed the parade route and blocked off the only road leading to the concert grounds. Only about 200 of the 2,000 Communists and sympathizers who had turned out to hear Robeson sing could reach the grounds. Robeson himself could not reach them to put on his usual act—a mixture of songs and pro-Soviet propaganda.

A large group of anti-Communists walking down the lane toward the concert grounds at about 8:30 that evening, after their parade, encountered a group of "guards" imported by the Communist Party for its concert. Someone in one of the two groups—it was never learned who or in which group—threw a stone or a fist. More stones and fists flew. Then a Communist guard stabbed one of the local veterans. This provided the spark that set off a wave of violence. By the time police had restored order and dispersed the crowds, it was too late for the Communists to hold their concert.

The Communist Party, following Olgin's 1935 advice, was not going to take this defeat "lying down." Several days later it succeeded in renting an abandoned golf course about one mile from the picnic grounds where the concert was originally scheduled and announced

that it would hold a concert there on September 4, with about 15,000 people in attendance.

The week following was one of intense activity for the Communist Party and its fronts. The party went about recruiting guards from the goon squads of unions it controlled in the New York City area. In the city itself it held rally after rally, and all party units and cells were activated to whip up attendance for the concert. The public rallies and party press were calculatingly used to develop a riot situation. The party and its agents challenged, insulted, and goaded the people and veterans of Peekskill in statement after statement, doing everything possible to enrage them.

At a rally in Harlem, Paul Robeson announced that he would sing again in Peekskill and that he would be protected by 3,000 "security guards." "This marks the turning point!" he thundered. "From now on we take the offensive."

Howard Fast, the Communist Party's "great American novelist," who has since broken with the party, told a Communist-front audience that 20 of Robeson's guards had held off 1,000 anti-Communists the night of the first riot (an obvious impossibility if, as the Communists claimed, the anti-Communists wanted—and had planned—violence). "The thousand new Americans, for all their big talk, were not very brave hand-to-hand in the dark," he said.

At another Communist-front gathering, Fast openly and directly charged that the Peekskill veterans had "stabbed their own in a plot to accuse us of murder." (A flashlight picture taken the night of the first riot revealed a Communist Party "usher" standing about 15 feet from Howard Fast with a knife in his hand.)

Benjamin Davis, a member of the party's National Committee who was then being tried before Judge Medina under the Smith Act, stated on another occasion:

> We warn all the flunkies of Wall Street, whether they wear white sheets or black robes like Judge Medina, that we are peace-loving people. But we are not pacifists and we are going to stand up toe to toe and slug it out.

The Communist Party injected the racial and religious issues into the controversy with the obvious intent of further inflaming passions. The Daily Worker of August 29, 1949, stated:

> What was the target of the Peekskill violence? The 14,000,000 members of the Negro community of the United States. But in warning the Negro people that they must submit to the planned World War III or face lynchings at home, the pro-war mob is following the pattern used by the Germans in preparing Germany for war. That pattern is to silence the nation as a whole by first assailing the Jews, the Negro people, and the Communists.

The Peekskill veterans, after some debate and hesitancy because of what had happened following their first parade, decided to hold another one on the day of the newly scheduled concert. Only about 2,000 veterans were in the line of march for the second parade. They had had only 3 days to organize their counter demonstration this time, and some groups which had planned to participate in it had been

turned back by the police, who were anxious to prevent another roadblock. Police and state troopers were out in force for the occasion. About 500 were stationed in the area because feeling was running so high and there was obviously the danger of more violence.

About 15,000 Communists and fellow travelers turned out for their concert. They were surrounded by a triple cordon of 2,500 Communist "security guards" led by a Communist Party functionary, Leon Strauss, who wore the uniform of the U.S. Army and the insignia of a lieutenant. The guards stood shoulder to shoulder and were well armed—with pepper, tire irons, can openers, baseball bats, and similar assorted weapons.

Both the concert and the veterans' parade were peaceful. No incident occurred during them. The Communist Party, however, added insult to injury to the anti-Communist paraders and onlookers. An amplifier set up at the concert by the Communists carried the words of the party's speakers to those outside. Howard Fast, in his speech, hurled insult after insult at the anti-Communists and taunted them with the epithet, "un-American filth."

When the concert ended, those who had attended it started to leave the grounds in automobiles. A stone was thrown—it is still not known by whom. Again, the spark was lit and mob violence broke out. Stones, soft-drink bottles, tomatoes, and other objects were hurled at the cars of the departing Robesonites. Three were overturned. Scores of car windows and windshields were broken and, before the rioting ended and order was restored, over 150 persons had been injured.

When night fell, about 700 of the Communist Party's guards were still on the golf course. As one truckload of them left, it was stopped and one of the guards swung a bat at a state trooper. After this, all remaining cars were stopped as they left the area—and over 200 baseball bats and 50 other assorted weapons were confiscated by the police.

Violence in Union Square

A year later, in 1950, the New York Labor Conference for Peace planned a "peace" rally in New York City's Union Square, traditional gathering place of leftist agitators. This group was the local affiliate of the National Labor Conference for Peace, cited as a Communist front by this committee in 1951. It subsequently merged with the American Peace Crusade, which, after extensive hearings, was also cited as a Communist front by the Subversive Activities Control Board. The rally was to be held at 5:00 p.m., the New York City rush hour.

The Kremlin had launched its attack on South Korea a little over a month earlier. The police department refused to grant a permit for the rally on the grounds that it might cause serious public disorder. This decision was upheld by the mayor and also by a justice of the State Supreme Court, to whom the New York Labor Conference for Peace carried an appeal.

The Communist Party decided to defy the law and, through the New York Labor Conference for Peace, announced that it would hold the rally despite this ban. When this became known, over 1,000 policemen were ordered into the area on the afternoon of August 2. They cordoned off Union Square to prevent the Communists from entering

it. Police estimated that there were roughly 2,000 Communists and sympathizers and 8,000 bystanders in the area of the square shortly after the time the rally was scheduled to begin.

Communist sympathizers were circling the square in small groups, whispering among themselves. At about 5:40 p.m., one man shouted: "Let's go!" Concealed banners carrying slogans such as "Hands off Korea" and "We Want Peace" were uncovered. About 500 Communists and sympathizers rushed the lines of the police, who linked arms to hold them back.

When most of the Communist rioters failed to break through the police lines, they started chanting "Open up the square!"—just as Communist Archie Brown, 10 years later in the San Francisco City Hall, led the Communists there in chanting "Open the doors!"

Some of the rioters, however, had managed to break through the police lines and regroup inside the square. It became necessary for the police to move in on these and on other groups that were formed outside the police lines to disperse them. The Communist rioters, both men and women, refused to obey the police orders to leave the square and kicked, bit, and punched the police while resisting removal.

Five hundred demonstrators moved up to Madison Square, where they were also dispersed by the police. Later that night, considerable numbers of Communist sympathizers also turned up in Times Square. The police, however, who had been alerted to this move, were on hand to prevent trouble, and no incidents occurred.

The scheduled speakers for the Union Square rally included Paul Robeson; Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, chairman of the party's Peace Information Center; and Leon Strauss, a vice president of the Communist-controlled Fur Workers Union—the same man who, wearing a U.S. Army uniform and insignia, had bossed the party's goon squads at the Peekskill riots.

The day after the riot in Union Square, Robert Thompson, a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party and its New York State chairman, who was also being tried under the Smith Act, issued an official statement on the Union Square riot in the name of the New York State Committee of the Communist Party. In it he referred to the riot as "a courageous display." He stated that:

> The courage of the thousands of demonstrators, and their ability to carry forward their action in the face of police provocation and attacks, will inspire Americans of all opinions, and especially workers, to press forward the fight for peace in a thousand different ways.

Thompson also stated that the resistance of the demonstrators to the ban on the rally was "a glorious chapter in the fight of the American people against the warmakers." The demonstrations, he said, "will be hailed by millions of Americans desirous of peace and security," and that:

> The demonstration of Aug. 2, was an important step in proving that it can be done—that the people will not give up the fight against war, will not surrender the streets or their right to fight for peace.

The mood of the party in this 1949–50 period, as these riots and other events indicated, was a fighting mood, a mood of defiance and

also a mood of confidence, in spite of the fact that events were going against it in this country. It was hitting back at its enemies at every opportunity. It was in this period that some Communists threatened that the day would come when President Truman and other Government officials would be hanged in the streets for what they were doing to the Communists. The Communists thought of themselves as being steeled in battle, of having their faith and courage, their mettle, tested, and being hardened by struggle.

Without doubt, if it were not for certain conditions beyond the control of the party, it would have continued to use the same tactics and there would have been more mob violence similar to that which took place in Peekskill and in Union Square. Like true revolutionists and soldiers in the field, the Communists were not going to surrender until it was impossible to fight any longer and the battle had been decisively lost.

Two developments which brought about the end of the Communist rioting and violence were:

1. The Korean War and the intense anti-Communist feeling which developed because of it not only caused the loss of party members, but also of fellow travelers and dupes. The party found it impossible to turn out thousands of people for meetings, rallies, and demonstrations, as it had been able to do in the past. To a great extent, in the atmosphere of those days, few people—except for hard-core party members—were willing to be associated with any clearly Communist or suspect organization. Mob violence and rioting, therefore, became impracticable for the party.[1]

2. The other factor was an intensified Government drive against the party leadership in the form of Smith Act prosecutions. As a series of additional group indictments followed the 1949 trial of the party's National Committee, the party was compelled to go deeper and deeper underground to protect itself. Tactically, it became unwise for the party, under these conditions, to foster mob violence. For these reasons, the brief period of Communist-instigated rioting which started in 1949 had ended by the close of 1950.

The 1950's

For a period of 5 or so years the party remained almost completely underground and there was no Communist violence. In the late 1950's, the party gradually began to come out in the open again. This was made possible by a number of developments, some internal, others international in character.

On the international scene, there was the end of the Korean War; the death of Stalin; the liquidation of his successor, the dreaded Soviet Secret Police chief, Lavrenti Beria; and the emergence of the so-called collective leadership in Moscow. This was a period of weakness in the Kremlin. As Khrushchev fought his way to the top, he, therefore, adopted a soft approach in his dealings with the West. His main theme became "peaceful coexistence." He continued this policy for a

[1] The party was still capable of ordering large numbers of its own members out to stage violent demonstrations. For reasons stated in the following paragraph, however, this became tactically inadvisable. In addition, the Communists, in most circumstances, prefer to avoid purely "party" violence and seek to induce others into bearing the major part of the rioting burden for them.

number of years as he established himself more firmly in power and sought to completely consolidate his position. He urged summit meetings and the breaking down of tourist barriers, the exchange of official and unofficial delegations of all kinds, etc.

The natural result of these developments—despite the horrible example of Hungary in 1956—was a softening of resistance to communism and a lessening of anti-Communist sentiment within the United States.

There were also developments within this country which brought about a change in climate and made it possible for the Communists to come increasingly out into the open.

A series of Supreme Court decisions which threw out the Smith Act convictions of many party leaders and upset long-standing anti-Communist legislation caused widespread resentment among the citizens of this country—but had other effects as well. Psychologically, these decisions were a blow to the anti-Communist people of this country, undermining their morale, at the same time that they were a shot in the arm to the Communist Party—an indication that the Government's drive to destroy the party's effectiveness through Smith Act convictions of its leadership and other legally based moves against the conspiracy were coming to an end, or at least a temporary halt.

These decisions also provided extensive ammunition for the ultra-liberals and leftists who had been consistently promoting the line that anti-Communist activity and prosecution is somewhat anti-American, a violation of civil liberties and constitutional rights, and punishment of "mere dissent."

The Fund for the Republic and some other groups in this country spent huge sums of money during the mid and late fifties, turning out pamphlets, books, and brochures and reprinting articles which supported this line. During the same period, it became popular in certain circles to promote the line that the Communist Party was no longer a danger to the United States. It had lost so many members and was so torn by internal dissent, it was said, that it had become completely ineffective.

The Communist Party, during this period, also worked intensely to create a climate conducive to more open activity on its part. Individual party members were ordered to infiltrate community and national level organizations—PTA's and civic, church, women's, and similar groups—and promote the peaceful coexistence and "anti-communism is un-American" line.

To a certain extent, the party was also aided by the foreign policies adopted by the United States. The natural effect of summit meetings, increased trade, exchanges, and tourism between the United States and the Soviet Union was to promote a certain tolerance of communism and to undermine vigorous opposition to it. Psychologically, these policies were a definite assist to the party in emerging from the underground and, as it would say, "resuming its place in the mainstream of American life."

As previously pointed out, the party's main concern during the 1950's was to achieve respectability. This was also one of Krushchev's main desires. For this reason, there were no mob riots nor any other instances of violence staged by the Communist Party in the United

States during this period. The tactical situation was such, from the Communists' point of view, that use of force and violence as a weapon during this period would have been bad, both for the party and for Khrushchev, who was doing all in his power to lull the West into a false sense of security.

1959 and 1960

The last year and a half has seen a great change in Communist tactics. Khrushchev still talks of banning the bomb and of disarmament, summit meetings and peaceful coexistence, but numerous statements made by him and other Communist leaders in the recent past indicate that he does not believe in peaceful coexistence in all implications of the phrase nor as non-Communists generally interpret it. The whole world—the Americas, Europe, Asia, Africa—as noted earlier in this report, has been torn by greatly increased Communist-fomented violence and rioting and also by revolutions and civil wars.

As noted in this committee's Annual Report for 1959, Allen W. Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, stated in December of last year that while Khrushchev was continuing to talk peaceful coexistence in all his communications with the West, he had secretly told Communist parties everywhere that, ideologically, there never was—and never can be—peaceful coexistence between communism and capitalism.

As indicated in earlier sections of this chapter, Soviet and U.S. Communist publications during 1960 have stressed the same theme—*peaceful coexistence does not mean the end of the class struggle; collaboration of classes is not the way to Communist victory*, even though avoidance of all-out war may be. This line has been stressed in articles and speeches published during the past year in international Communist agitation and propaganda organs such as "International Affairs" and the "World Marxist Review," which are distributed throughout the world in over a score of different language editions.

A significant development which has generally been neglected by information media in the United States during the last few years has been the increasingly open ties between the U.S. Communist Party and the Kremlin. Not only has a considerable number of U.S. party officials and functionaries traveled to the Soviet Union and Iron Curtain countries since the Supreme Court's 1958 decision eliminating any passport restrictions based on Communist affiliations, but U.S. party officials have been contributing articles to international Communist propaganda and theoretical organs. The U.S. party is making less and less effort to conceal its ties with the international Communist apparatus.

One of the most recent examples of this type of activity was provided by Gus Hall, the present leader of the U.S. Communist Party, who contributed an article to the September 1960 issue of the "World Marxist Review." In this article, Hall emphasized a theme that Soviet theoreticians have been stressing lately—obviously on Moscow's orders. Hall stated in his article that the major question facing the world Communist movement is this—

> is it possible to force U.S. imperialism to retreat while at the same time preventing it from provoking or precipitating an armed conflict?

By forcing "U.S. imperialism to retreat," Hall, like all Communists, means bringing about the elimination of U.S. military defense bases in foreign countries, the withdrawal of all American troops from foreign soil, and numerous related developments that would finally result in the isolation of this country in a hostile world and thus its eventual capitulation to communism.

Hall, in his article, gave Communists in all parts of the world his answer to the question he had raised. It was "Yes."

Conditions are such today, he wrote, and Communist power has grown so that they can now defeat the United States, bring about its surrender, without a world war. How can this be done? Hall answered—

> the outlook for a retreat by U.S. imperialism is a realistic one. This, of course, cannot be achieved without mass actions, but this can be achieved without war. * * * but this will not happen automatically * * *.
>
> To view the new possibilities of halting war as a gift of some abstract objective development * * * would lead to passivity and inaction.

Hall stated that, in considering the possibilities of Communist success in forcing U.S. imperialism to retreat, the recent "heroic" mob violence in Japan (which toppled the Kishi regime and forced the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit) was "a good example to study."

He hailed recent developments in South Korea, Turkey, Cuba, and the Congo—all characterized by large-scale violence and some by revolution—as steps in the retreat of U.S. imperialism.

Hall's statement that the U.S. cannot be defeated "without mass actions" and his specific reference to mob violence in Japan and armed uprisings in other countries provide an answer to the question of Communist-inspired mob violence and rioting in this country in the immediate future. Hall, the U.S. party boss, said that they are essential to the defeat of the United States. In so stating, he told U.S. Communists and party members everywhere that the Communist violence that has racked the world for the last year must be continued and stepped up in tempo.

Basically, there was nothing new in what Hall wrote in his article. The Soviet theoreticians Konstantinov and Momdzhan said it earlier in somewhat differently couched terms in the previously quoted Pravda article reprinted in Political Affairs. James S. Allen said basically the same thing in his remarks to the Communist Party National Committee meeting last March. This is now a basic theme in all major Communist directives, both U.S. and international.

The "mass actions" Hall has in mind, as clearly indicated by his references to recent developments in certain countries, are demonstrations, peace marches, strikes, student riots, and mob violence in varied forms—all the "class-struggle tactics" the Communists have used extensively in certain parts of the world during the last year, particularly the more violent forms.

Hall, in his article, also reiterates a doctrine stressed in previously quoted Communist propaganda statements. He wrote that the recent trend of increasing Communist power and stepped-up military, economic, and political difficulties for the United States "has greatly

sharpened up class antagonism and has stepped up the mood of struggle * * * in all sections of the population."

Within the United States, there is already evidence that the Communist Party is adopting a much more aggressive attitude. The riots in San Francisco last May 13 and the Communist-inspired domonstrations against this committee the day before and the day following the riots are not the only such developments to take place in this country during the past year.

Last February the committee held hearings in Washington on Communist activities among youth groups and the Communist-staged World Youth Festival held in Vienna in the summer of 1959. As a result of Communist planning and agitation, several busloads of young people, primarily college students from Philadelphia and New York, numbering perhaps 200, attended these hearings with the obvious intent of creating an incident. They jeered anti-Communist witnesses and wildly applauded and cheered the Communist Party members as they loudly, and with strong expressions of contempt, declaimed against the committee while on the witness stand. The disorder was such that, on several occasions, the chairman found it necessary to threaten to clear the hearing room if it did not stop.

At the committee's hearings in Washington on Communist infiltration among seamen's groups and on waterfront facilities—which followed the San Francisco hearings and the Woodstock Hotel meeting of the Youth Against the House Un-American Activities Committee—the party employed the same tactics. A contingent of young Communists, fellow travelers, and dupes from New York was in attendance in the hearing room. No incident developed—but only because the Capitol police had been alerted to the possibility of trouble and ejected several ringleaders from the audience when they disobeyed the subcommittee chairman's order (given after several pro-Communist outbursts) that there be no demonstrations for or against any witness.

Why the Shift in Communist Tactics?

There can be little doubt that Khrushchev and the U.S. Communist Party were profiting by the soft tactics they were using up to a year or so ago. Without question, the U.S. Communist Party had made very real gains in the years 1955–59 in acceptability, in breaking down barriers to Communist infiltration in a number of important fields, and in developing wider acceptance for its line on a number of vital issues. Without question, the same applied to the Soviet Union. When sweetness and light—peaceful coexistence, exchanges, summit meetings, and so forth—were achieving so much for world communism, why did it suddenly desert these tactics?

A certain answer to this question is impossible without information from the inner circles of the Kremlin itself. There are a number of factors, however, which would make this shift logical from the Communist view of sound strategy and tactics.

Some students of mass psychology have advanced an interesting theory—and one that seems to have considerable validity—in answer to this question. They point out that in time of war or near war, in periods of bitter political, economic, and propaganda enmity (such as the cold war), there tends to be a polarization of people toward their own governments and against the enemy. Everything their govern-

ment does is right; everything the enemy does is wrong. Their country is good; the opposite side is evil. An end to war or relaxation of tensions, however, breaks up this polarization. People begin to see evil, imperfections, or wrong in their own government and some good, "humanity," and decency in the enemy.

The early 1950's, with a Communist-Free World war being fought in Korea, was a period of intense polarization in the United States and, it is reasonable to believe, within the Soviet Union as well. But depolarization set in as the war ended and as Khrushchev, rising to power, brought about something of a thaw in the cold war and also on his home front because the Soviet Union was weak in an internal political sense.

This had immediate benefits for him and the international Communist movement. Cold analysis indicates that, since the end of World War II, as far as Western-U.S.S.R. relations are concerned, the basic policy of the West has been one of coexistence with communism, rather than aggressive effort to bring about its downfall. For this reason, the West grabbed at the opportunity to talk over "differences" with the Soviet Union, to break down barriers by "letting people get to know and understand one another" through exchanges and tourism, thus theoretically easing tensions and the danger of war.

This provided Khrushchev with a breathing spell and gave him the opportunity to consolidate his power within the Soviet Union, while lulling and disarming the West politically and psychologically, if not militarily. His brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolution was no more than a brief setback to him in this endeavor. Despite the revolting nature of his actions at the time, the West proved itself eager to forget the whole thing and to go about getting along with Khrushchev's professed desire for "peace." The rape of Tibet, carried out by Khrushchev's Chinese henchmen, scarcely ruffled the surface of the increasingly "good relations" between Moscow and the West, which appeared to be becoming increasingly conditioned to the acceptance of Communist atrocities. A short while later, Khrushchev was invited to tour the United States—and did so, though a few years earlier a storm of public protest had forced the cancellation of a visit by Tito.

Apparently, in the view of the students of mass psychology, there were also other—and very different—results of Khrushchev's soft policy that he did not foresee. The depolarization that took place in the United States and in the West in general also took place within the Soviet Union and, because the government there has no popular base, was more widespread and deeper than in the free world. It became a real threat to Khrushchev, to the Soviet Government, and to the aims of the world Communist movement. American tourists, exchange delegations, and other cracks in the Iron Curtain that developed as a result of Khrushchev's policies had the effect of convincing the people behind the Iron Curtain—who tend to doubt Communist propaganda anyway—that the United States was not so warlike, that it sincerely desired peace, and that it was not the great threat to their very existence that their leaders claimed. There has been extensive evidence of unrest and dissent within the Soviet Union in recent years which, it is reasonable to assume, developed, to a considerable extent at least, because of this depolarization.

There is also evidence of continuing conflict in the higher Soviet party elements, something of a split in the military, and economic

stress in the Soviet Union—brought about by the need to meet U.S. competition in the economic aid field, to keep abreast of it in the arms race, to help Red China industrialize, etc.

Any dictator, faced with such problems, would want to repolarize all elements surrounding and under him—and would normally do so by turning their antagonism to a foreign danger or devil—an enemy.

In the view of the committee there was another danger, too, for world communism in Khrushchev's soft approach. It affected Communist parties in all parts of the world.

This was the danger of doctrinal confusion. Not all Communists—especially those in the colonial areas and even in some countries of Western Europe where there are mass Communist parties—are as well trained in the refinements of Marxist-Leninist philosophy as are the U.S. Communists who, generally speaking, are of a higher educational and intellectual level. For this reason, Khrushchev's constant harping on "peaceful coexistence" led them to believe not only that war, but internal force and violence as well, was now outmoded or no longer necessary.

This led to a slackening of Communist aggressiveness, drive, and vigor. Many Communists were applying the concept of peaceful coexistence *within* nations, as well as between them. The fact that so many recent Communist directives, both national and international, have harped on the theme that peaceful coexistence does not mean the end of the class struggle (which includes force and violence) is a strong indication that this condition actually developed within Communist circles.

James S. Allen, in his remarks to the U.S. Communist Party's National Committee, claimed that this "revisionist" concept was the major error of the U.S. party in recent years.

The official U.S. party newspaper, The Worker, in the fall of 1960 featured a series of three articles on the subject "Peaceful Coexistence—What It Is; Can It Be Won?" by William Weinstone, long a leading party figure. In his third and final article on this subject Weinstone wrote:

> There are wrong ideas about peaceful co-existence . . . in socialist and Communist ranks.

After making this revealing admission—which provides conclusive evidence of the correctness of the committee's views on this development—Weinstone went on to define peaceful coexistence in largely negative terms, emphasizing what it is not, as well as stating what it is:

> peaceful co-existence means competition, that is, a contest, a class struggle . . . not without stress and strain—*but without war—cold or hot.* Though war can be averted, ideological struggle cannot, nor can the class struggle be avoided in the capitalist countries * * *.
>
> There is also the harmful position of the revisionists who think peaceful co-existence can come about without struggle * * *.
>
> This is a dangerous illusion. * * * peaceful co-existence will not come of itself but must be *imposed* on the imperialists . . . by unceasing struggle. (Emphasis added.)

It is most revealing that, after Khrushchev and other top-ranking international and national Communist personalities and numerous

Communist publications in all parts of the world had been talking about peaceful coexistence for 5 years or so, The Worker should have to publish a series of three articles explaining, for the benefit of U.S. party members, just what peaceful coexistence is and stressing what it is not. It is even more revealing that Weinstone should admit that even Communists have confused ideas about what peaceful coexistence really means.

The committee's view on this point is also supported by the November 1960 Moscow Manifesto of the 81 Communist parties. It, too, in speaking of peaceful coexistence, stressed—for the benefit of Communists in all parts of the world—what it does not mean. It also emphasized the "intensification of the class struggle" theme:

> The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace. Peaceful coexistence of states *does not* imply renunciation of the class struggle, as the revisionists claim. * * *
>
> Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems *does not* mean conciliation of the socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties. (Emphasis added.)

The depolarization within the general populace of the Soviet empire and also the slackness within Communist Party ranks had to be ended.

Khrushchev, therefore, decided to take corrective action. Weighing all factors in the over-all situation, including such elements as the West's weak-hearted reaction to Hungary and Tibet, Khrushchev decided that the best thing to do was to issue his directive, referred to in December 1959 by CIA Director Allen W. Dulles, which stressed the fact that there never can be a letup in the class struggle—and to follow it up with numerous similar directives in international and national Communist publications.

There is evidence of Khrushchev's attempt to repolarize party members everywhere, and also the people within the Communist empire, in the trial of U–2 pilot Francis Powers, the RB–47 incident, the accusations of espionage against American diplomatic personnel (and even against American visitors) in Iron Curtain countries and their subsequent expulsion, as well as in Khrushchev's breakup of the summit conference, his cancellation of President Eisenhower's scheduled visit to the Soviet Union, and other "tough" and alarm-sounding actions and statements.

The depolarization theory, in the committee's view, is sound as far as it goes. Taken alone, however, it could develop dangerous illusions about the true strength of the Soviet empire and lull this country into a false sense of security. For while there is truth in this theory of a tactical shift based on a Communist weakness, there are other factors that are equally valid and which must be taken into consideration in an objective analysis of why Moscow has shifted its tactics and of the seriousness of the threat this country faces today.

One outstanding fact is that, despite certain unquestioned signs of weakness and tension behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, Communist power and influence has spread during the last 7 or so years.

The fact that, until the Cuban incident, the Communists had not seized complete control of any government since the partition of

HOLD FOR RELEASE MONDAY, A.M., JANUARY 2, 1961

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C.

The United States faces a period of Communist-fomented violence and mass demonstrations designed to further national and international Communist objectives, the House Committee on Un-American Activities predicts in its Annual Report for 1960, released today.

The Committee Report states that the inclusion of an anti-violence clause in the present U.S. Communist Party constitution, adopted in 1957, was"fraudulent", an attempt to convince the American people that the Communist Party had changed and become respectable and law-abiding. Khrushchev, the report states, believes that without "a shadow of a doubt" Communists will be able to seize power in the United States only by force and violence, even though he says that, in some other countries, they may be able to do so by peaceful means.

In support of its statement that Khrushchev is taking a "tougher" line toward the U.S. than some other Communist leaders have in the past, the Committee contrasts a statement Khrushchev made to the above effect at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party with a statement by Karl Marx that Communists could seize power in the U.S. by peaceful means even though, in most countries, they could do so only by force and violence.

Chairman Francis E.Walter, in a foreword to the report, warns that present Communist tactics are designed to render conventional military forces as ineffective as possible for defense purposes. For this reason, he says, the American people, cannot rely wholly on this country's armed forces to protect them from Communist conquest. Present Soviet tactics, he declares, are a challenge not only to the government but to all citizens to become combatants in the "unconventional warfare" being waged against this country by the international forces of communism.

as possible for defense purposes. For this reason, he says, the American people, cannot rely wholly on this country's armed forces to protect them from Communist conquest. Present Soviet tactics, he declares, are a challenge not only to the government but to all citizens to become combatants in the "unconventional warfare" being waged against this country by the international forces of communism.

The Committee finds "considerable evidence" that the Kremlin has decided the present tactical situation calls for greater use of violence. The increased use of this weapon in the U.S., it says, will fit in with a pattern of stepped-up Communist violence in all parts of the world. The Committee quotes and analyzes a number of Communist directives published in the U.S. Party press and in international Communist organs in the last year in support of its view.

The U.S. Communist press, the Committee notes, associated the Communist-instigated mob violence which broke out in San Francisco during Committee hearings there last May with the Communist violence that has racked many other nations during the past year.

In an analysis of why Khrushchev has shifted from soft to harsh tactics, the Committee expresses the view that this switch has been brought about by a number of factors: economic problems in the Soviet empire, created by the need to meet the challenge of the U.S. in the arms race, in the foreign aid field, and in helping Red China industralize - as well as by dissension within Soviet ruling circles and the military.

The Committee also expresses the belief that, while the soft tactics adopted by Khrushchev during his rise to power benefitted him by softening Western resistance to communism, they also had a weakening effect within the Soviet Union and among Communists everywhere, and have brought about a let-down in Communist aggressiveness. Within the Soviet Union, the Committee says, Khrushchev's summitry, promotion of exchange delegations, and similar policies had a depolarizing effect on the general populace, undermining such belief as they had that the U.S. was a mortal enemy and thus creating dissention and unrest.

There is evidence of Khrushchev's harder approach to the West, the Committee states, in the trial of U-2 Pilot Francis Powers, his breaking up of the Summit conference, his cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to the Soviet Union and his accusations of espionage against American diplomats and tourists. The Committee interprets these actions as attempts on his part to repolarize the people and also the feuding party and military elements around himself by creating an image of a deadly enemy.

Khrushchev's tougher tactics, the Committee says, are also based on the fact that Communist strength has increased in many countries outside the Communist empire. For this reason, Khrushchev decided to adopt more aggressive tactics in such areas "on the sound strategic concept that when your strength increases you push the attack harder, taking advantage of every possible opening."

The Committee report states that the Communist Party is stepping up its drive to capture the young people of this country in order to use them for its subversive purposes. This development, it says, means that parents, clergymen and educators must play a more active role in helping the young people of the U. S. "understand and resist deceitful Communist propaganda and agitation tactics."

In a chapter on "Legislative Recommendations," the Committee calls for Congressional action authorizing the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons whose purpose in travelling abroad is to engage in activities which will advance the objectives of the Communist conspiracy. Amendments to the Smith Act, redefining the words "organize" and "advocacy", are strongly recommended. The Committee also urges legislative action to repair the breach in the Federal Employees Security Program, which opens wide the door for the retention on Government payrolls of persons disloyal to the Government of the United States.

It states that legislation is needed which would authorize the President to prescribe regulations relating to industrial security in order to assure the integrity of classified information in defense facilities and cure the serious deficiency in our laws resulting from the decision of the Supreme Court in Greene v. McElroy. The Committee also

It states that legislation is needed which would authorize the President to prescribe regulations relating to industrial security in order to assure the integrity of classified information in defense facilities and cure the serious deficiency in our laws resulting from the decision of the Supreme Court in Greene v. McElroy. The Committee also makes additional recommendations for legislation pertaining to maritime and communications security and the importation of foreign propaganda into the United States.

French Indo-China in 1954 does not negate this. The shift in power between the free world and the Soviet voting blocs in the United Nations is one case in point, a reality it would be foolish to ignore.

It is an unquestioned truth that in the Americas, in Asia, and in Africa the national Communist parties have generally increased in numbers and in influence;[1] that they have played important roles in toppling anti-Communist regimes; and that, in a number of nations, Soviet-oriented or weak, tottering representative governments have been set up in place of these regimes or of former colonial rulers.

Another fact is that Khrushchev's doctrine of peaceful coexistence and his teaching that World War III is no longer inevitable is based on the stated claim that there has been a drastic change in the power ratio between the "socialist" and the free world. Communist strength has grown so much, he says, that the "socialist" powers can now compel the "imperialist" U.S. and its allies to live in peace; that they can prevent this country from going to war, even while it is being slowly chewed to bits and destroyed by world communism.

Whether or not this is actually true—and whether or not Khrushchev fully believes it—this doctrine has been repeated so often in Communist publications of all kinds and in the speeches of leading Communists in the past few years that, without question, Communists in all parts of the world, accustomed to taking Moscow's word as gospel, unquestionably believe it. They, therefore, act accordingly—with confidence, strength, aggressiveness—as events of the last year have proved.

Khrushchev sees this—the reality of growing Communist strength in areas outside the Communist empire—even while he sees the weaknesses within it. Therefore, he decided on a more aggressive strategy of stepped-up violence, not only because of his fear of the depolarization process under his former policies and the need to create a foreign menace to rally all elements to him but also on the sound strategic concept that when your strength increases you push the attack harder, taking advantage of every possible opening.

Another factor should be considered. Khrushchev has several times predicted that the grandchildren of the present American generation will live under communism. Recently he has gone farther than that. Last August 5, while visiting in Austria, he told that country's Minister of Transport and Electricity:

> In the short time I still have to live, I would like to see the day when the Communist flag flies over the whole world.

He has made a number of similar statements within the past year.

If, as he claims, he has outlawed international conflict as a weapon of Communist conquest,[2] he must realize that his dream will never come true by any democratic, educational method of selling communism to the world. It can come true *only by internal revolutions* that will quickly bring one country after another into the Communist orbit.

---

[1] Moscow now claims a world Communist Party membership of over 36 million compared with 33 million a few years ago.

[2] The committee places credence in the testimony of Captain N. F. Artamonov (see p. 73) that Soviet military strategy is based on the doctrine of surprise nuclear attack on the United States should a situation ever develop making a one-stroke Communist victory a probability. It believes that Khrushchev, in the interest of world communism and his own ambitions, is capable of deceiving even Communists on the question of rejecting war as a means of achieving Communist conquest of the world.

In this respect, it is important to note the effectiveness of the tougher strategy he has developed. He is striking at the United States in a way that makes it extremely difficult for the United States to defend itself adequately. Generally speaking, this country cannot easily use its A-bombs and tremendous military strength to counter his attacks. He is not using Soviet troops, but rioting students and intellectuals, many of whom are not Communists and do not even realize they are serving the Communist cause when they riot or take up arms.

Documents of the 1959 Communist Party convention and other information developed by the committee during the past year in its hearings and investigations, reveal that the U.S. Communist Party is greatly intensifying its drive to win over the young people of this Nation in order to use them in its efforts to subvert the United States. Among other things, a new, disguised Communist newspaper for youth is being published and new youth organizations have been formed.

These developments, coupled with the key role played by youth in the San Francisco riots and in the more massive demonstrations of violence in other nations, should serve as a warning—particularly to parents, clergymen, and educators—that, in the years immediately ahead, they must play a much more active role in helping the young people of this country understand and resist deceitful Communist propaganda and agitation tactics. They also indicate a need for continuing, close congressional study of this phase of Communist activity.

The U.S. Communist Party, the committee believes, will follow the orders of Moscow, which has told it, in effect:

> Internal violence is the order of the day. Riots are one of the weapons you are to use in the present situation to assist our grand strategy for victory.

The committee cannot tell or predict just how successful the U.S. Comumnist Party will be in the immediate future in again using this weapon to achieve its—and Khrushchev's—aims. It feels certain, however, that the answer to this question depends to a great extent on the Congress of the United States. Through its legislative and primarily through its informing functions, the Congress, if it accepts the challenge, can do much to counter the effectiveness of the new Communist tactics. For it to ignore this basic shift in the nature and intensity of Communist activity within our own borders, could have grave consequences.

It is not merely the committee that will be the target of Communist force and violence. Whether future Communist-inspired mob violence has the committee or some other agency or group as its target, it will be freedom and the United States form of representative government which, in the final analysis, are under assault. The violence will be part of an over-all plan of battle, engaged in by the Communists to promote the coming of the day when Khrushchev's dream will come true and the United States of America, like all other nations, will have its effective government in Moscow.

CHAPTER II

HEARINGS

AIR RESERVE CENTER TRAINING MANUAL[1]

On February 25, 1960, Dudley C. Sharp, Secretary of the Air Force, appeared before the committee in executive session, at which time inquiry was made into the reasons why the Air Reserve Center Training Manual, which dealt, in part, with the subject of Communist infiltration of the churches, had been withdrawn by the Air Force.

The manual had been prepared by the Air Training Command and issued on January 4, 1960, for use in courses for Air Force reserve noncommissioned officers assigned to the Continental Air Command. Shortly thereafter it became the object of a great deal of controversy throughout the Nation.

The manual was first brought to public attention on February 17 by Mr. James W. Wine, Associate General Secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., when he released a statement to the press, together with a copy of a letter he had written on February 11 to Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Department of Defense.

In his letter, Mr. Wine vigorously protested that section of the manual which, in a discussion of Communist infiltration into the churches, made various references to the National Council of Churches. He urged that the Department of Defense withdraw the manual from use and recall all distributed copies. He also requested that the National Council of Churches be given a complete explanation of the entire matter.

In his opening statement the chairman pointed out that:

> Recently the Secretary of the Air Force, Dudley C. Sharp, was quoted in the press as "categorically repudiating" the Air Reserve Center Training Manual as representing Air Force views. Much of this manual deals with problems of Communist infiltration and subversion. Indeed, in the sections dealing with this subject, there appear numerous quotations derived from hearings conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities, in which are presented authoritative statements by experts on each of several facets of the subject.

The chairman noted that sworn testimony from religious leaders who have escaped from Communist regimes amply demonstrates the intensity of the warfare which communism is waging against the churches. In addition, several undercover operatives of the FBI

[1] See "Issues Presented by Air Reserve Center Training Manual," February 25, 1960, Hearing before Committee on Un-American Activities.

who had served in the Communist Party had testified that members of the party have penetrated church groups under party directives. Their testimony has also shown that certain persons holding membership in the Communist Party have also professed to be ministers of the gospel.

As an appendix to his remarks, the chairman inserted into the record excerpts from representative testimony on these matters.

He also pointed out that the record reveals that Communists have duped some members of the clergy, as well as lay leaders of the churches, into supporting Communist fronts and causes which masquerade behind deceitful facades of humanitarianism and that, although these persons were not necessarily consciously supporting Communist enterprises, the net result was, for all practical purposes, the same.

Secretary Sharp was accompanied by Major General Thomas C. Musgrave, Jr., Director of Legislative Liaison; Major General Lloyd P. Hopwood, Director of Personnel Procurement and Training; Brig. General Robert F. Burnham, Air Provost Marshal; Colonel John W. Baer, Executive Assistant to the Secretary; and Major Lee Secrest, Legislative Liaison.

The Secretary told the committee that the Air Reserve Center Training Manual first came to his attention on February 16, when he received a copy of Mr. Wine's letter to Secretary Gates. Secretary Sharp initiated an inquiry and found that the manual had been withdrawn for investigation on February 11 and all distributed copies recalled, under directions from General Hopwood.

General Hopwood related that he had taken this action when two staff officers brought to his attention questions in three general categories regarding the manual, one of which concerned the section headed "Communism in Religion." He pointed out that the information on which the section was based came from a "variety" of sources, not only the Committee on Un-American Activities; that he had not checked the validity of the sources; but that he had approved the withdrawal of the manual because, as Secretary Sharp testified—

> the Air Force should not enter into the controversy as to whether or not a particular organization or group is infiltrated by communism.
>
> Certainly, unless this group is listed on the Attorney General's list of subversive activities, I feel that this is something we should keep ourselves clear of * * *.

Secretary Sharp told the committee that in his statement regarding withdrawal of the manual he had never intended a repudiation of the integrity, validity, or accuracy of any of the testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities which was quoted in the manual. He read the letter which he had written to Mr. Wine and said:

> There is certainly nothing in this letter that indicates we are apologizing. I am simply saying we do not condone the publication of this kind of controversial detailed material in our training manual.

It was also brought out that on February 24 the Washington Evening Star had quoted Mr. James Wine of the National Council of Churches as saying—

> the Air Force has agreed to amend portions of a second manual objectionable to the council * * *. The second manual—205–5—is used now as a guide to security indoctrination.

This second manual, titled "Guide for Security Indoctrination," had been issued to all commands by Air Force Headquarters in 1955 to establish procedures and administrative practices for implementing the Air Force Security Indoctrination Program.

Secretary Sharp said that, to his knowledge, no one in an official position in the Air Force had assured Mr. Wine that there would be changes in this manual. In fact, he declared:

> I read the manual 205–5 * * * and the portions of it that refer to communism in American churches and American schools. I do not find them objectionable. I think they are proper to have in a manual of this type.

The pertinent paragraphs of Air Force Manual 205–5 concerning which Mr. Wine had been quoted in the Washington Evening Star were inserted in the record. They read as follows:

> A while back Americans were shocked to find that Communists had infiltrated our churches. It isn't so shocking though when you consider how the Communists are using Russian churches today. They want to do the same thing here. They want to teach the Soviet gospel from the pulpit.
>
> The Communist Party, USA, has instructed many of its members to join churches and church groups, to take control whenever possible, and to influence the thoughts and actions of as many church-goers as they can.
>
> Communists form front organizations especially to attract Americans with religious interests. The party tries to get leading church men to support Communist policies disguised as welfare work for minorities. Earl Browder, former head of the American Communist party, once admitted:
>
> "By going among the religious masses, we are for the first time able to bring our anti-religious ideas to them."
>
> Are there Communist ministers? Sure. The Communists have members in just about every profession in our country. Of course no clergyman admits he is a Communist when he is one (he is required to keep his membership a secret), but he still does Communist work. The House Un-American Activities Committee lists two Communist ministers—the Rev. Claude C. Williams, a former Presbyterian whose congregation kicked him out for party activities, and the Rev. Eliot White, retired Episcopalian who served as a delegate to a Communist convention and lectured at Communist meetings.
>
> As to whether Communist ministers are a real danger, let's turn to a statement by former President Herbert Hoover [1]:
>
> "I confess to a real apprehension, so long as Communists are able to secure ministers of the gospel to promote their

[1] Source of this statement as given in the Air Force manual is incorrect. It was actually made by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI.

evil work and espouse a cause that is alien to the religion of Christ and Judaism."

Communists try everything when it comes to churches. They sneak disguised propaganda into church bulletins. They send Communists around to lecture church groups. The head of the Communist Party once spoke at Union Theological Seminary in New York, and the legislative secretary of the party addressed a conference of 100 ministers in Washington, D.C. The Communists order their younger members into youth groups where they can spread atheism and recruit new Communists. Atheism, Communist-style, is also spread through various organizations like the People's Institute of Applied Religion, which teaches Communist ideas under the disguise that they are Christian teachings.

Again, to stop Communists, *we must be careful not to attack the majority of faithful ministers and church-goers.* We must merely search out those who back Moscow right down the line. We can do this, first, by understanding and supporting the teachings of our own religions to the hilt; then, by getting rid of those who try to pass off Communist ideas as substitutes for what we know are true religious teachings.

The following resolution adopted by the National Council of Churches concerning this material was also inserted in the record:

Resolved: That the General Board of the National Council of Churches:

* * * * * * *

(3) Insists that the material contained in Air Force Manual 205–5 "Guide to Security Indoctrination" dated 1955, which is considered equally objectionable, be deleted and that a full explanation of all matters incidental to the appearance of such material in these manuals be made public at the earliest possible moment * * *.

Secretary Sharp said that he had read the quoted resolution and was disturbed by its implication that the council hoped to exercise censorship over what would appear in Air Force manuals. He expressed the conviction that "we have a right and duty to educate our people as to the dangers of communism so that they can be on guard against it all the time."

He indicated that the revised edition of the Air Force Manual 205–5 will again point out that there is a continuing effort to infiltrate the churches of this country, and declared that "if it were not in the manual, we would be very derelict in our duty to inform our people."

COMMUNIST TRAINING OPERATIONS, PARTS 2 AND 3[1]

(Communist Activities and Propaganda Among Youth Groups)

Youth has always been a prime target in the Communist plan to take over the world. Realizing that the future success of their conspiratorial movement depends upon recruiting and using the energies

[1] See: "Communist Training Operations (Communist Activities and Propaganda Among Youth Groups)," Part 2, Feb. 2 and 3, 1960, and Part 3, Feb. 4 and 5 and Mar. 2, 1960, Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities.

of each new generation, the Red planners do not miss an opportunity to sell their programs to the youth of the world. A mere cursory look at the Communist record reveals that they do not wait for opportunities to present themselves, but ambitiously attempt to create favorable situations for the spread of their poisonous ideas.

This Communist effort to seduce young minds was the subject of hearings held February 2, 3, 4, and 5 and March 2 of this year—a continuation of the hearing on Communist Training Operations held in July 1959. Whereas the instant hearings were centered mainly on Communist activities and propaganda among youth groups, last year's hearings dealt with the more general problem of the process whereby an intelligent American citizen, young or old, can be molded into a dedicated Communist.

Frank S. Meyer, a former Communist who had served for a number of years in the educational and organizational work of the Communist Party, testified last year that Communist education is "not merely a matter of spreading to the members and people beyond the members," certain ideas and principles, but is aimed to "transform the whole man"; in other words, to turn people into robots who must obey the whims of a few Communist masters.

Closer examination of the application of Communist techniques for subverting youth was the purpose for holding further hearings on Communist training operations this year. On February 2, the committee heard testimony from Herbert A. Philbrick, well-known as a former undercover informant of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Communist Party. Mr. Philbrick told how, in the late thirties, when he was a young man, he was duped into joining the Cambridge Youth Council, a Communist front, along with 350 to 400 other young people.

He remained in the organization at the FBI's request and soon came to an awakening and realization of the tremendous amount of activity, time, and effort the Communists were devoting to young people in America. At the request of the Communists he joined a great many Communist front youth organizations, including the American Student Union and the American Youth Congress. Finally, he was invited to join the Young Communist League, which he described as the prototype of the Communist Party in the form of its organization and in the nature of its meetings, its basic purpose being to serve as a training ground for eventual membership in the Communist Party itself.

Mr. Philbrick testified that of the many young people who joined and participated in the Communist front organizations, only the most promising were invited to join the Young Communist League. Then, as now, the Communists were not so anxious to interest youth in specific issues as to involve them in the web of the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Philbrick's testimony was most significant in its revelation that the tactical principles followed by the Communists in the field of youth work at that time are the same ones employed by the party today in their attempt to subvert our Nation's youth. Only the names, the organizations, and places have changed—as the hearings revealed.

Some of the Communist youth tactics which Mr. Philbrick discussed may be briefly sumarized as follows:

1. Use of secret Communists on campuses to assist in having Communist speakers invited to address students.

2. Use of the apathy, indifference, and complacency of some administrators of schools and colleges.

3. Use of the names of prominent adults to sponsor Communist youth organizations.

4. Use of books, pamphlets, leaflets, etc., to soften up and finally indoctrinate the students—literature published by fronts to hide its Communist origin. Mr. Philbrick said the Communists knew that—

> perhaps very few of the young people would be vulnerable to direct appeals by the Communist Party itself.
>
> They knew, for example, that if a leaflet or a booklet or a pamphlet were to be given to the young person and it was clearly and accurately labeled Communist Party, they might tend to disregard it or perhaps not to believe it. However, if they were to take the same propaganda written at Communist Party headquarters, take off the label "Communist Party" and put on a new label, such as "American Youth for Democracy," this, they hoped, would sufficiently disguise the subversive propaganda and the material would be accepted.

5. Use of public demonstrations, youth festivals, lobbying activity, and tours and trips of various kinds.

6. Influencing youth organizations to affiliate with international Communist youth organizations.

7. Requiring hard-core Communists to work within so-called mass youth organizations such as the YMCA, labor organizations, church organizations, etc.

8. Use of the same old propaganda themes. As an example, Mr. Philbrick cited a leaflet from his files, prepared at Communist Party headquarters in 1941, in which the Communists alleged that civil liberties were being violated by "witch hunts in Congress" and that traditional student freedoms were being destroyed in the Nation's high schools and colleges. Today, almost 20 years later, the Communists are harping on the same theme.

9. Use of Aesopian language. Mr. Philbrick testified:

> When the Communists, for example, speak of the sharp struggle for peace, democracy, and security, what they really mean, of course, is the struggle on the part of the Soviet Union to win, to be victorious over the free world. The struggle for peace, democracy, and security, when translated into ordinary language, means the struggle for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the United States. When they speak of the democratic movements of youth, they, of course, do not mean democratic movements. They mean a totalitarian movement.
>
> They say * * * "Groups of youth interested in Marxist study and action have appeared in a number of cities among college students, teen-agers, and other youth."

> When they talk about Marxist study groups, they mean, of course, Marxist indoctrination groups, and it is interesting to note that the Communists are here bragging that these Marxist indoctrination groups have been formed among college students, teen-agers, and other young people.

The importance of acquainting ourselves with these Communist tactics was underscored when Mr. Philbrick called attention to several articles in well-known Communist publications and a resolution passed at the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party held in December 1959, which point to a resurgence in the Communist drive to recruit youth. Mr. Philbrick, referring to the title of a recent book about communism by J. Edgar Hoover, said that the term "Masters of Deceit" is truly a most accurate and revealing description of the Communist agent and that, for this reason, the task of combating this Communist effort will not be easy.

10. He emphasized that the Communist approach to young people is in upright humanitarian, and idealistic terms. He called for greater efforts by the schools and colleges to provide young people with information concerning communism, its appeals, and techniques.

In concluding his testimony, Mr. Philbrick gave this advice:

> I would suggest several things. I would, first of all, suggest that our loyal young people support this committee in its efforts to make the truth be known because there is one thing that the Communist Party fears more than anything else, and that is the truth. They know they cannot survive if the truth were known. Hence, it is important that this committee and other investigating committees constantly procure and obtain the truth and make known the facts about communism and Communist activity in our country. Therefore, young people should support the work of this committee and of the Congressmen who give so much of their time to it.
>
> Secondly, our young people should demand that their schools and colleges provide them with information about communism. This is not being done now. There are very few schools and colleges which have adequate courses concerning communism. This they should demand because it is impossible for them (or for anyone) to fight an enemy unless they know their enemy. Third, of course, our young people should not only be aware of the great crisis that we are in today, the worldwide crisis, the threat that communism poses against all of the free peoples and all of the free world, but they should also diligently study, learn, and come to appreciate the wonderful heritage, the great things of value which we have to protect and defend in this country.
>
> If they come to truly understand the value of the heritage given to us, bequeathed to us, I am sure that then they will realize the vital importance of defending and maintaining the wonderful freedom we have in this Nation and to fight against the subversive activities of the Communist apparatus.

Mr. Philbrick's outline of Communist strategy in the field of youth work was enlarged upon by subsequent witnesses who detailed current Communist activities on the youth front. The first of these was

Andrew Ilyinsky, an employee of the Customs Bureau of the United States Treasury who had, for several months prior to his testimony, made a study of Communist propaganda addressed to schools, colleges, libraries, and youth groups in the United States from Communist organizations abroad. A report prepared by Mr. Ilyinsky which includes the substance of his testimony before the committee was published as an appendix to Part 2 of the hearings.

This report describes the purpose, kind, and quantity of Communist propaganda entering this country. For background purposes it contains a brief history of the worldwide Communist youth movement and also discusses its major strategies.

It points out that at the end of World War II the Communists cashed in on the widespread sentiment for creation of international bodies which would enable people to establish a firm basis for lasting peace by creating the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) and the International Union of Students (IUS), as well as many other international organizations not explicitly in the youth front, and using these organizations to promote the lie that the Soviet Union leads the vanguard of democratic countries while the United States is the arch-enemy of peace and democracy. The only alternative these Red organizations offer students in a crisis-ridden world is to espouse actively the cause of communism and Soviet Russia.

According to Mr. Ilyinsky's testimony and report, the WFDY and IUS conduct elaborate brainwashing campaigns against the youth of the world. They publish scores of magazines, pamphlets, and books in all languages, even Esperanto. They sponsor pen pal movements, emphasizing personal contacts and the trading of stamps and pictures of movie stars. Exchanges of letters between those professing interest in student and youth affairs, arts, history, literature, economy, social science, and contemporary politics are especially encouraged because such subjects are even more conducive to the presentation of the Communist point of view. Mr. Ilyinsky also mentioned the international youth festivals as an effective weapon in the hands of the Communists. Whatever the form of propaganda used by the Communists—magazines, letters, etc.—in the beginning, he said, the approach is almost always made by appealing to the idealistic aspirations of youth through such slogans as coexistence, cooperation, unity of youth interests, international friendship, cultural exchange, anti-colonialism, disarmament, struggle for peace, etc. Communism or Marxist ideology as such are seldom mentioned, Mr. Ilyinsky stated, but the fact that the initiative, the leadership, and the propaganda on such matters come from Communists is the best propaganda for communism.

Mr. Ilyinsky said that a spot check of the Port of New Orleans during the 12 months of 1959 revealed that 300,000 packages, each containing from 5 to 15 separate publications, entered that port alone—and that the volume of Communist propaganda entering through other American ports may be even larger. According to Mr. Ilyinsky, none of this material is labeled as Communist propaganda.

On February 4, 1960, the committee heard the testimony of Herbert Romerstein and Charles Wiley. Mr. Romerstein, a member of the Communist Party from 1947 to 1949, has maintained a professional interest in Communist activities among youth organizations as a research specialist. Mr. Wiley is a writer in international affairs and also has a background as a research specialist on communism. Both Mr. Wiley and Mr. Romerstein attended the Communist-arranged

Seventh World Youth Festival held in Vienna, July 26–August 4, 1959.

It has been apparent to observers for a number of years that one obvious reason for the Communist Youth Festival is to play off small, inarticulate delegations as poor seconds to the Russians in sports, culture, and so forth. Thus an important reason for the committee's concern with the festival was to consider the advisability of sending to future festivals, delegations which are versed in Communist tactics and accredited by the United States Government as true representatives of American youth.

It was developed in the course of the hearings that the American delegation to the Seventh World Youth Festival was not able to cope successfully with Communist tactics. Although many loyal Americans present made a valiant effort to defend the American way of life, they were frustrated at every turn by a disciplined Communist organization. This was true in spite of the fact that the Communists were in a minority in the U.S. delegation. How this small minority controlled the delegation, and why the loyal Americans were outmaneuvered, was the subject of inquiry.

Testimony disclosed that prior to the festival the Communists undertook elaborate arrangements to control and promote it. The major aim was to attract non-Communist and neutral youth. Mr. Philbrick and Mr. Ilyinsky both stressed the importance the Communists attach to mass meetings of the festival type which would attract youth from all countries—not only Communist or fellow traveler youth but, as Mr. Ilyinsky said, "youth which would be just attracted by the idea of meeting hundreds and hundreds of members of other nations."

Mr. Romerstein testified that two international Communist organizations, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, with its offices in Hungary, and the International Union of Students, with its offices in Czechoslovakia, set up an International Preparatory Committee to run the Vienna Youth Festival (these two organizations were discussed in detail in Mr. Ilyinsky's report to the committee). Mr. Romerstein felt that the Communist bosses did not really trust their young members and, therefore, most of the "youth" placed in charge of the international apparatus were in their forties or over, and the American representative to the International Preparatory Committee was Holland Roberts, a 60-year-old Communist. Along the same lines, Mr. Romerstein revealed that a group of young Communists in the United States had also been prevented from forming a nationwide Marxist-Leninist youth organization because the older Communist bosses did not feel they would be able to control the younger Communists at the time.

Mr. Romerstein and Mr. Wiley told of attempts to impose Communist leadership on the United States delegation even before it left for Europe. There were two organizing committees for the festival in this country. One was the United States Festival Committee with headquarters in New York, which was run by Joanne Grant, Marvin Markman, Jacob Rosen, and Alan McGowan—all of whom had been identified as Communists by Albert Gaillard, who testified the previous day.

Many non-Communists registered through the New York office. Mr. Romerstein attempted to do so but was denied festival credentials because he was known to the Communists as a former party member

who was now an active anti-Communist. Communist hoodlums beat up Mr. Romerstein outside the meeting place of the New York group when he appeared there one evening and started distributing, to those entering the meeting, leaflets protesting his exclusion.

In Chicago there was another festival organizing committee called the American Youth Festival Organization, which was run by a Miss Barbara Perry. A number of non-Communists, some of whom, like Mr. Romerstein, had been denied credentials by the New York group, obtained them from the Chicago organization.

Before the delegation left for Vienna, Marvin Markman was appointed, not elected, chairman of the United States Festival Committee. When the delegation arrived in Vienna July 25, on the eve of the festival, the majority of American delegates, being non-Communists, decided to repudiate Mr. Markman, and elect their own chairman. But before the pro-American group could get its plan off the ground, the Communists, fearing loss of control of the delegation, broke up the meeting of the delegation and walked out.

The next day the Communists proposed that the delegation be ruled by a committee composed of four delegates from the New York and four delegates from the Chicago group. This proposal was the subject of protracted negotiations between the two groups, which lasted for days. Mr. Wiley, who had been mistakenly accepted as an American Communist and thus was able to attend meetings of the Communist faction, testified that he observed Communist officials, none of whom were Americans, order the American Communists to negotiate this proposal but not come to an agreement under any circumstances. Mr. Wiley commented that this raised an interesting question as to the sincerity of Communists when they negotiate on world problems with the West.

According to Mr. Wiley and Mr. Romerstein, the "interpreters" attached to each delegation actually ran them and were selected by an Austrian Communist organization. A middle-aged Austrian named Max Schneider performed this function for the American delegation. Mr. Wiley testified that it was he who gave the order to the Communists to break up the group's meeting on the eve of the festival when it became apparent that the Communists would lose control. Mr. Romerstein testified that Max Schneider's supervisor was Heinrich Brandweiner, a holder of the Lenin Peace Prize and president of the Communist-run Austrian Peace Council. Mr. Romererstein said that Brandweiner was a member of the Nazi Party before his latest betrayal of his country, Austria, to the Communists.

Mr. Wiley, when asked how, in his opinion, the American non-Communist youth fared in trying to cope with Communist tactics, replied:

> I think you can best describe the majority of the non-Communist delegates as boys who were sent to do a man's job. Some of them had read a little of Marx, they knew a certain amount of theory—and I should stress this here—there were notable exceptions, but by and large they knew some Communist theory, they knew nothing of Leninist tactics, and when they were put up against a trained, organized Communist machine they were simply rolled over. The Communists knew the parliamentary tricks, they knew every

dirty trick in the book, and these American kids were just completely unable to cope with it.

Because some people believed that all young Americans who attended the festival were Communists or pro-Communists, Mr. Wiley submitted in evidence a list of the names of several hundred young Americans who had gone to Vienna and had stood up against the Communists.

The committee also heard Joseph Charles Jones, a student at Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, North Carolina; Stephen Tyler, of New York, a free lance writer; and Julius Szentendrey, a former Hungarian freedom fighter and presently secretary general of the Association of Hungarian Students in North America. Mr. Jones and Mr. Szentendrey attended the Seventh World Youth Festival. Mr. Tyler had attended the Sixth Youth Festival in Moscow in 1957 and later visited Red China, under Communist auspices, as part of a youth delegation.

Mr. Jones stated that he went to Vienna to present an American point of view and became indignant when he heard Paul Robeson, Jr., speak at the festival, purporting to represent the Americans in attendance and following the Communist Party line.

Mr. Tyler described the propaganda purposes of the youth festivals and how the Communists use them to convert non-Communists to communism. He also detailed his experience in Red China, where, although he was conducted on guided tours, he was able to perceive the absolute control exercised over the lives of its people by the Communist apparatus.

Mr. Szentendrey testified that he attended the Seventh World Youth Festival in Vienna in the summer of 1959 because, as a freedom fighter in the Hungarian revolution, he had seen communism in action and wanted to help "by sharing my experience with others, so that other naive people who came from the so-called non-Communist nations and did not have any firsthand experience with Soviet tactics could really be enlightened."

Mr. Szentendrey stated that the young Communists at the festival were not permitted to mingle freely with the anti-Communists and were rigorously controlled by the hierarchy of the Communist apparatus. In the course of his testimony, Mr. Szentendrey vividly portrayed the terror of communism in action as he had experienced it in his native Hungary before he was forced to flee immediately following the revolution. In concluding his testimony, Mr. Szentendrey stated:

> I think I should say that communism has a face which it likes to show outside, and then it has its own practice of dealing with people and dealing with their countries it has occupied. In this second aspect it is very dangerous for all the human rights and the public freedoms—freedom of speech, religion, the church, and everything else.
>
> The Communist dictatorship is a dictatorship by a small minority of the people over the whole nation, and they do not have any contact. They have allegiance only to the Communists and the Communist Party.

Of special interest to the committee was the testimony of Albert Gaillard of New York City, twenty years of age. While Mr. Gaillard knew some of the Communist youth associated with the youth festival

drive, his testimony was primarily valuable in showing how, even in the day-to-day operations of the Communists right at home, the appeal is always made in deceptive terms.

The Communist Party was portrayed to him as the champion of the Negro people and Mr. Gaillard, young and idealistic, who had known hardship in his life, was quick to believe the lie. He joined the party in January 1957. He was soon disillusioned and, in August 1959, left the party. He testified:

> I went into the party with the idea that the Communist Party was the solution to the Negro people's problem, but as my experience in the Communist Party I find out that the Communist Party wasn't a party for the Negro people, that the Communist Party have one of the worse discriminations in their own party themselves.
>
> If the Communist Party can use the Negro people as a tool and use them for their own advantage, the Communist Party don't give a darn about the Negro people * * * and I also witnessed discrimination in the party. If something happened to the Negro people, the Communist Party they would be the first ones to jump up and say, "We must do this and we must do that." And then if the Communist Party find out * * * the Government of this country changed things around and worked the things in the favor of the Negro people, it seems like the Communist Party they get sad and they want to drop the issue altogether. In other words, the Communist Party want to see the things really keep on happening to the Negro people so they can use this as a weapon to try to rally the masses of the Negro people around the Communist Party.

During the period when he was a Communist Mr. Gaillard served as president of the Harlem Youth Congress, which was established and controlled by Communists. He testified that, as a member of the Communist Party and as president of the Harlem Youth Congress, he collaborated with Jesse Gray, regional organizer of the Communist Party in Harlem; Herbert Williams, a member of the Communist Party; Ben Davis, Jr., chairman of the New York State Communist Party; and Hunter Pitts O'Dell, a member of the Communist Party. He also identified as persons known by him to be members of the Communist Party, Alan McGowan, Jacob Rosen, Freeman Robinson, Joanne Grant, Paul Robeson, Jr., Marvin Markman, and Carla Reeve.

Mr. Gaillard detailed the activities of the Harlem Youth Congress and of Communists who worked in other youth groups in New York City. He also described his experiences in an underground movement to organize Negro youth in the South.

He quoted Hunter Pitts O'Dell as saying that the South is the new revolutionary front and that the Communist Party has agents working underground in that area. Mr. Gaillard's first mission in the South—selling Communist books to Negroes—ended in failure, leaving him broke and stranded in Charleston, South Carolina. He learned, he said, that Southern Negroes just would not buy Communist propaganda.

In the course of his testimony Mr. Gaillard stated that on the very morning on which he was to appear before the committee he was

approached by Jesse Gray, whom he had known as a member of the Communist Party, and that Jesse Gray urged him to invoke the fifth amendment and not to testify against the Communist Party; that Jesse Gray stated, "If you don't take the fifth you will be in pretty bad shape in the Harlem community, I will have leaflets out."

Jesse Gray testified that his occupation was executive director of the Lower Harlem Tenants Council. When questioned respecting the comments which, Mr. Gaillard testified, Mr. Gray had made to him on the morning of the hearing, namely threats against Gaillard if he testified, Gray at first said, "I had no conversation with Mr. Gaillard," but thereafter invoked the fifth amendment regarding the incident. Mr. Gray likewise invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he was a member of the Communist Party up to the morning of the hearing, but denied that he was a member of the Communist Party at the moment of his testimony.

Hunter Pitts O'Dell, of New York City, identified as a member of the Communist Party by Albert Gaillard, testified that his occupation was that of a life insurance underwriter. He declined to answer all questions respecting his Communist Party membership or activities on the ground that his answers might tend to incriminate him.

Benjamin Davis, Jr., of New York City, national secretary of the U.S. Communist Party—and directing force of the Harlem Youth Congress according to Mr. Gaillard's testimony—invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer any questions respecting his activities as a Communist by first vilifying the committee and then invoking the fifth amendment against self-incrimination.

Leroy Wolins, of Chicago, Illinois, was subpenaed because of the leadership role he played in 1957 and 1959 in the formation of the U.S. Youth Festival Committee.

Wolins attended the 1957 World Youth Festival in Moscow and, in violation of U.S. passport restrictions, later visited Red China. At the time of his appearance he was secretary of the Communist-controlled Chicago Committee of American-Soviet Friendship. The committee also had confidential information that Wolins had been active in the Communist Party in California and Illinois. Wolins refused on the grounds of self-incrimination to answer all pertinent questions, including those relating to present membership in the Communist Party.

Jacob Rosen, a student at the City College of New York, identified as a Communist Party member by Albert Gaillard, appeared in response to a subpena. There was displayed to Mr. Rosen an article from the New York Times of July 30, 1957, which stated that he had carried the United States flag in a youth festival parade in Moscow and had dipped it in salute to Nikita Khrushchev. In response to most questions, including this incident and present membership in the Communist Party, Mr. Rosen invoked the fifth amendment.

Fred Jerome, who had been denied a passport to attend the Sixth World Youth Festival in Moscow on grounds of Communist Party membership, launched into a typical Communist-type attack upon the credibility of a preceding witness and was dismissed from the witness stand by the chairman.

Alan Hugh McGowan, a student at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, identified by Albert Gaillard as a member of the Communist Party,

appeared in response to a subpena. There was displayed to Mr. McGowan a number of photographs taken at the Vienna Youth Festival in which he appeared, and there was read to him the testimony of Charles Wiley that an international Communist agent at the festival had directed McGowan "to break up the meeting" of the American delegation at Vienna. Mr. McGowan refused to answer any questions on the subject matter and to affirm or deny current membership in the Communist Party on the ground, among others, that his answers might incriminate him.

Joanne Alileen Grant, of New York City, identified as a member of the Communist Party by Albert Gaillard, testified that she worked as a secretary for the Indian delegation to the United Nations. There were displayed to Miss Grant documents revealing that she had served as executive secretary of the United States Festival Committee in New York City. There was likewise displayed to Miss Grant an article from the July 1959 issue of the anti-Communist Workmen's Circle "CALL," which reported that the Soviet Union's Beryozka dancers had participated in some festival fund-raising affairs in the United States and that Miss Grant had stated that Nicolai Burov, secretary of the Soviet U.N. Mission, had aided in getting the dancers for these affairs. Miss Grant was also interrogated about the organization and control of the Youth Against the House Un-American Activities Committee. In response to all questions respecting the foregoing, Miss Grant declined to answer on fifth-amendment grounds.

Marvin Markman, of New York City, who has been identified as a member of the Communist Party by Albert Gaillard, appeared in response to a subpena. There were displayed to Mr. Markman a copy of a letterhead in which his name appeared as chairman of the United States Festival Committee for the Seventh World Youth Festival and a copy of a passport application executed by him in October of 1958 in which he failed to answer questions respecting membership in the Communist Party. Mr. Markman was also confronted with the testimony of Charles Wiley, Herbert Rommerstein, and Joseph Charles Jones respecting his activities and contacts with international Communist agents in Vienna. In response to all questions, Mr. Markman refused to answer on the ground, among others, that his answers might incriminate him.

Paul Robeson, Jr., of New York City, also identified as a member of the Communist Party by Albert Gaillard, appeared in response to a subpena. There was displayed to Mr. Robeson a photostatic reproduction of a passport application signed by him in 1958 in which he failed to answer questions regarding his Communist Party membership but pursuant to which a passport was nevertheless issued to him. Mr. Robeson was asked, "On the date on which you filed this application for a passport, which, according to this document which you have identified, was October 21, 1958, were you on that day a member of the Communist Party?"

Mr. Robeson refused to answer on the ground, among others, that his answer might incriminate him. He similarly refused to affirm or deny the testimony of Albert Gaillard respecting his membership in the Communist Party and the testimony of other witnesses respecting his activities at the Youth Festival

The hearings were protested by Youth Against the House Un-American Activities Committee, with headquarters in Room 201, 421 Seventh Avenue, New York, which issued bulletins and news releases attacking the hearings, chartered buses to carry youth protest delegations to Washington, held meetings and generally conducted a campaign of vilification against the committee.

One rally of the group held on January 31, 1960, featured Clark Foreman, executive director of a cited Communist front, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, as master of ceremonies. At that rally he lavishly praised Harvey O'Connor, an identified Communist. Pete Seeger, another identified Communist, provided entertainment. Mrs. Dorothy Marshall, who has a long record of service to Communist organizations over the years, was also featured on the program.

The committee also found significant the fact that the organization occupies the same rooms and uses the same staff as the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the principal aim of which is to abolish this committee and discredit the FBI.

After carefully evaluating the testimony and other evidence in its possession, the committee concluded that the Harlem Youth Congress and the Youth Against the House Un-American Activities Committee are organizations created and controlled by the Communist Party for the purpose of carrying on the Communist program among youth.

Several times in the course of the hearings when uncooperative witnesses expressed defiance of the committee, the protest delegation of the Youth Against the House Un-American Activities Committee, which packed the hearing room, broke into cheers and applause. The committee chairman had to threaten to clear the hearing room to maintain order.

The hearings provided a good example of how the international Communist apparatus functions in support of its own. At the time of the hearings the committee received 11 protest letters from youth organizations in as many foreign countries. Each of these letters expressed "sorrow," "concern," " astonishment," "distress," etc., that the committee had subpenaed young Americans who had attended the Vienna Youth Festival in the interests of world peace.

The Communist inspiration behind these letters was apparent from the reference, in all the letters, to *only five witnesses*. Actually, ten witnesses who had attended the Vienna or other youth festivals were subpenaed to testify in the hearings. The international Communist apparatus apparently had not heard about the four anti-Communist witnesses and did not learn about the sixth Communist witness (who was subpenaed at a later date) until after the protest letters had been written.

COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Testimony of Frantisek Tisler [1]

Grim new evidence of the Communists' determination to strip America of its military and political secrets was offered to the committee during the past year by the testimony of Lt. Col. Frantisek Tisler.

[1] See "Communist Espionage in the United States: Testimony of Frantisek Tisler, Former Military and Air Attaché, Czechoslovak Embassy in Washington, D.C.," May 10, 1960, Hearing before Committee on Un-American Activities.

Colonel Tisler was chief of Czechoslovakia's military intelligence operations in the United States from 1955 until his defection in July 1959. In a series of off-the-record committee sessions—at a time and place which cannot be revealed for security reasons—he divulged the inside story of an Iron Curtain nation's clandestine intelligence activities in the United States under diplomatic cover. The committee publicly released a portion of this testimony on May 10, 1960.

The witness disclosed that he had headed a staff of six Czechoslovakian military intelligence officers (including himself) sent to this country for the purpose of collecting classified information related to United States military developments. "This mission," he declared, also "called for me to attempt to personally recruit American citizens to act as agents and, in their agent capacities, to furnish me with intelligence on classified materials * * *."

To legalize their presence in the United States, these military intelligence officials held nominal assignments with the Czechoslovakian Embassy in Washington, D.C., and the Czech permanent delegation to the United Nations in New York. Colonel Tisler ostensibly served as military and air attaché at the embassy. Two of his military intelligence officers also were "officially" members of the military attaché's staff; two others used the cover of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (one, the Czech UN delegate); and another agent worked out of the commercial attaché's section of the embassy.

Colonel Tisler stated that he was "constantly reminded that my position as military and air attaché was simply a cover" and that his fictitious title actually did aid him in his intelligence work:

> This legal reason enabled me to meet and develop contacts with other foreign diplomats who were accredited to the United States. It also provided me with a valid reason for being interested in military developments in the United States. * * * As the military and air attaché I had office facilities in the Czechoslovak Embassy in Washington, D.C., and these office facilities were used to house my records and equipment, which I used for clandestine intelligence purposes.

The Czech Embassy also served as headquarters for other intelligence operations coming under the jurisdiction of the Czech Ministry of Interior, Colonel Tisler informed the committee. This separate network of intelligence officials was responsible for the "covert and overt" collection of political, scientific, and economic intelligence in the United States, the witness said, and its members also held ostensibly routine assignments on the staff of the embassy or the delegation to the United Nations.

Colonel Tisler estimated that approximately 45 per cent of the personnel of the Czech Embassy and the Czech delegation to the UN was engaged in some type of intelligence activity during the years 1955–1959.

The assignment of Colonel Tisler to intelligence work in the United States came only after intensive special training in Czechoslovakia. In November 1954 he was assigned to the Military Intelligence Directorate of the Czechoslovak General Staff, Ministry of National De-

fense, and, from December 1954 until March 1955, received intelligence training which—

> emphasized items such as security, the use of cover, techniques for recruiting agents in the countries of the free world, the use of secret writing, codes, and all of the other techniques which are connected with covert military intelligence operations and which we previously discussed in off-the-record sessions.

The Czech Communist regime considered Colonel Tisler an "old, ardent Communist" because he had joined the Czechoslovak Communist Party in 1946, 2 years before the Communist take-over of government power. Colonel Tisler explained that he had believed in the Communist ideology when he joined the Communist Party as a university student, but that disillusionment began while he was a student at the Military Staff School in Prague from 1951 to 1954. The officer said he had observed Communists exploiting their party positions to obtain personal advantages in the army, and that his disenchantment with communism increased with such developments as the purge trials in Czechoslovakia in 1952, the "denigration" of Stalin, and unrest or revolution in Hungary and Poland in 1956. Colonel Tisler declared, however, that:

> The final factor * * * which led to my decision to break with communism was the fact that after I came to the United States in August 1955, I began to see for myself that communism as practiced in Czechoslovakia had misrepresented the true facts about the free world. The longer I stayed in the United States the better I was able to convince myself that if an individual was interested in freedom, human dignity, and life without terror, this could only be obtained in the free world. As a result I decided to remain in the United States and, as you know, I broke my ties with Czechoslovakia on July 25, 1959.

Testimony regarding the precise nature and details of the intelligence activities engaged in by Colonel Tisler and his associates in the United States could not be released following Tisler's appearances before the committee nor can they be released at the present time. However, the committee has made public Colonel Tisler's testimony concerning Czechoslovak Government contacts with two American citizens of Czechoslovak descent. The committee subsequently questioned the two individuals in public session regarding the allegations of the Czech intelligence officer. The results of the committee inquiry into this special aspect of Colonel Tisler's testimony is summarized below:

Testimony of Anthony Krchmarek and Charles Musil [1]

Anthony Krchmarek, chairman of the Communist Party of Ohio, and Charles Musil, identified Communist and long-time editor of *Nova Doba*, a Communist-dominated Czech language weekly published in Chicago, appeared as witnesses before the committee on May 26, 1960.

[1] See "Testimony of Anthony Krchmarek and Charles Musil," May 26, 1960, Hearing before Committee on Un-American Activities.

Colonel Tisler had described both individuals as being in "frequent contact" with officials of the Czech Embassy in Washington, D.C. He not only cited specific instances of personal meetings but also involved both individuals in exchanges of information and funds. Mr. Krchmarek and Mr. Musil invoked their privileges under the fifth amendment rather than affirm or deny many of Colonel Tisler's statements regarding their specific relationships with the Czech Communist Government. On a number of points, however, they denied that his information was correct.

Colonel Tisler, who said much of his information was based on official messages exchanged by the Czech Embassy in Washington, D.C., and the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia, testified regarding Krchmarek that:

The Czech Government was "very concerned" when Krchmarek was arrested by the United States Government in 1953 for trial under the Smith Act and the Czech Embassy, operating through intermediaries, transferred funds for use in Krchmarek's defense;

Members of the Czech Embassy staff contacted Krchmarek in 1956 for recommendations of names of public officials who might be invited to visit Czechoslovakia, and Krchmarek advised the embassy that certain individuals should be invited and certain others should not receive invitations;

A December 1958 report to Prague from the Czech ambassador on the subject of the recent United States elections contained as an attachment "notes from Krchmarek regarding these elections";

He was informed that Krchmarek, during a trip to Czechoslovakia in 1950, was associated with the Czechoslovak Foreign Institute, whose purpose is "the overt spreading of Czechoslovak propaganda and the exercise of covert Czechoslovak Communist Party control over the Czech and Slovak minorities abroad";

Krchmarek met the Czech ambassador in New York during August 1958, advised the ambassador that he had been elected to the executive committee of the national organization of the Communist Party, USA, and informed the ambassador of trends and developments in the American party;

The ambassador paid Krchmarek funds to cover travel expenses for the New York meeting;

Krchmarek had asked the ambassador to obtain from the Czech Communist Party financial support for Communist Party activities in America;

The Czech ambassador in January 1956 advised Prague that Krchmarek was without funds and recommended authority to pay him $3,000 for living expenses and propaganda activities.

In his appearance before the committee, Mr. Krchmarek invoked the fifth amendment in response to questions regarding meetings with representatives of the Czech Embassy in Washington, D.C., and New York and regarding association with the Czechoslovak Foreign Institute in Prague. "To my best knowledge," he claimed, he at no time received funds from the Czech Government. He invoked the fifth amendment, however, when asked whether he did receive funds, including traveling expenses, from the Communist Party of the United States.

Charles Musil, according to Colonel Tisler's testimony, was used as an intermediary between the Czech ambassador and Krchmarek and,

in that capacity, had a number of meetings with the Czech ambassador in January 1956 on the subject of "Krchmarek's status and difficulties" as a Smith Act defendant. Colonel Tisler described *Nova Doba*, which Musil edited, as "Communist-dominated" and generally following the line of the international Communist movement.

As a witness before the committee, Mr. Musil invoked his constitutional privileges against self-incrimination when asked whether he had had a number of meetings with the Czech ambassador early in 1956. He refused to discuss the subject of the meetings but insisted that he was not acting as an intermediary between the ambassador and Krchmarek and that, during the period in question, he had had no conversation with Communists regarding Krchmarek.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA DISTRICT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY[1]

Structure—Objectives—Leadership

Parts 1–4

Current operations of the Communist Party in Northern California—in terms of tactics, leaders, and techniques to avoid detection—were the focus of committee hearings held in San Francisco, May 12–14, 1960.

Extensive evidence of party actions on the national level was also received as party documents were put into the record tracing the activities of Northern California Communist leaders up to their roles at the Communist Party 17th National Convention in New York City, December 10–13, 1959.

A total of 46 witnesses testified before the committee in its first hearing in the area since the party, in 1957, reorganized and elevated its Northern California membership into a "district"—separate and distinct from the Southern California party apparatus.

Karl Prussion, who left the Communist Party in August 1959, after 26 years' membership, testified that Communists sought to fulfill "prerequisites" for the overthrow of the American form of government by "the infiltration of social, economic, and political organizations" in this country. By the process of infiltration, Mr. Prussion stated, Communists hope not only to gain leadership in the organizations but also to arouse in non-Communists hatred against big business and against the Government.

A former dedicated Communist who later became an informant within the party for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. Prussion described, from his own experience in party cells in the Los Altos, Mountain View, and Palo Alto communities, how Communists have concentrated on infiltrating non-Communist community-level groups. The witness said the Communists in his cell joined a "splendid" local civic organization dedicated "to the principles of our American way of life" and managed to make an impact on its policies. Specific Communist attempts to exert influence from within parent-teacher associations and political organizations were also described by the witness.

---

[1] See: "The Northern California District of the Communist Party: Structure—Objectives—Leadership," Part 1, May 12, 1960; Part 2, May 13, 1960; Part 3, May 14 and June 10, 1960; Part 4, Appendix. Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities.

Communists were directed to ditch the party-controlled political organization, the Independent Progressive Party, after the 1952 elections and to become active in the Democratic Party, Mr. Prussion stated. He named a number of Communists who became active in the California Democratic Clubs in the Palo Alto and Stanford areas as a result of this shift in party policy. Ed Ross, Los Altos salesman whose principal party assignment was activity in local Democratic Clubs according to Mr. Prussion, appeared as a witness before the committee but invoked his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination in response to questions dealing with party affiliation. Another witness called during the hearings was William Reich, of Oakland, who also invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he made his Communist Party affiliation known to the 8th Congressional District Democratic Council, which he served as corresponding secretary.

The aforementioned Ed Ross was also closely questioned by the committee regarding his contacts as a ball-bearing salesman with plants in missile and allied industries. Mr. Prussion had testified that Mr. Ross boasted to fellow Communist cell members on one occasion that he knew when and where missiles were fired, as well as the types of missiles and the direction of firing. Mr. Ross refused to affirm or deny Mr. Prussion's testimony.

Efforts to recruit non-Communist supporters for party policy and activities through front organizations created by the party were illustrated by the activities of the Palo Alto Peace Club. Set up by the party in 1949, this Communist front still uses "peace as a means of disarming, pacifying, and placating the citizenry of a nation," Mr. Prussion testified. Its official organ, "The Flashlight," serves as the "megaphone of the voice from the Kremlin," the witness declared.

Doris Dawson, identified by Mr. Prussion as a fellow Communist cell member and one-time president of the Palo Alto Peace Club, was called as a witness before the committee but invoked her constitutional privilege against self-incrimination in response to various committee questions, including that of whether she had been a paid functionary of the Communist Party.

Communist documents distributed to delegates to the party's 17th National Convention were introduced in the course of the hearings. The documents, which have been reproduced in an appendix to the printed hearings, verify that the party faithful, not only in California but throughout the Nation, are being called upon for intensive effort in infiltrating non-Communist organizations, with special emphasis on those dealing with labor, the Negro, youth, politics, and farmers. The documents include an important policy statement by the party's national leader, Gus Hall, and proposed resolutions for action by the convention. They were analyzed at the hearings by Mrs. Barbara Hartle, who testified on the basis of many years' previous experience as a full-time, paid functionary of the Communist Party. Mrs. Hartle declared that the Communist Party continues to exploit the privileges of democracy and, despite various public statements to the contrary, the party has not altered its basic

belief in the seizure of power by force. The party, she said, looks forward to "mass action," to—

> breaking through the bourgeois laws, traditions and conventions, and doing by force and by mass action, by sheer bodily weight and numbers, what you cannot accomplish through using the laws, the Constitution and the democratic rights * * *.

Considerable testimony dealt with varied techniques employed by Communists to obscure technical membership in the party. These techniques pose difficult legal problems which are under continuous study by members of the committee. Mr. Prussion described four types of party "membership":

> 1. They have one type of member who attends cell meetings, pays his dues.
>
> 2. They have another type of Communist, because he doesn't want to identify himself with the cell for fear of exposure by an informant such as myself, who has a courier pay his dues.
>
> 3. Then there are many, many Communists who have dropped out of the Communist Party, conveniently, so that they can hide their identity and in that way are better able to carry out the revolutionary work.
>
> 4. There is a fourth type of Communist who is never associated with a cell, but he is a Leninist, and so imbued with the forthcoming revolution that he works diligently wherever possible and keeps contact with Communist leaders on the higher level.
>
> This type of a Communist is usually a doctor, a lawyer, a political officer, and in the professional field of life.

The witness said that, in his experience, as many Communists have technically dropped out of the party to hide their identity in recent years as have remained in it as formal cell members. He described the chief purpose of these technical withdrawals as desire to hide Communist connections in view of the individual's occupation and to avoid the impact of security laws. He cited as illustrations two fellow cell members: William King, who resigned from the cell and retained party contact only on an upper level because he wanted to continue working as an electronics engineer in a local plant; and Elliott Wilson, who was the subject of a fraudulent expulsion from the party so that he could apply for a teaching license from the state and swear he was not a member of the party.

Mrs. Hartle also testified to the existence of a "large group of Communist followers or associates" who do not have formal party membership, pay dues, or attend meetings but, nevertheless, follow the discipline of the party insofar as their activities and field of work are concerned.

Quite another type of formal dissociation from the Communist Party was demonstrated to the committee as details of the "Vernon Bown case" were unfolded during the hearings. In 1959, as the result of a policy disagreement with higher party officials in the Northern California District, Bown was unwillingly ousted from his job as

organizer for an important party section in San Francisco embracing party members affiliated with the unions traditionally in the AFL. He was finally expelled from the party itself.

Documents written by Bown and a Communist section associate, Leibel Bergman, on the details of this internal party conflict were obtained by the committee from sources within the party and made part of the hearing record.

The documents provided striking corroboration of testimony regarding the totalitarian nature of the Communist Party organization. The written complaints of Bown and Bergman noted that Bown had been ousted from his party office and the party despite the support of other Communists in his club and section; that he was convicted at a party "trial" which neither he nor any of his representatives were allowed to attend; and Bown was never fully informed of the nature of the charges against him. There was better observance of the principles of justice in a Nazi court than in the Communist Party, the complainants observed in an appeal that went all the way to the National Convention of the party without results. Called as witnesses before the committee, Mr. Bown and Mr. Bergman invoked the fifth amendment in response to all questions relating to this party controversy. Similar stands were taken by two other witnesses, Jack Weintraub and John Andrew Negro, who, according to committee information, supported Bown in the inner party councils. Witness Prussion summed up the "democracy" in internal operations of the party as follows:

> Within the Communist Party there is total disregard for law * * * there are rigged trials, forced confessions, provocations of suicides of Communists who have deviated, reprisals of Communists who might deviate even on party strategy.

The committee called as witnesses five of the nine Communist Party functionaries who represented the Northern California District at the party's National Convention in New York City in December 1959. Despite party documents inserted into the record to show their participation in the convention, the following delegates uniformly refused to answer pertinent questions by the committee:

Archie Brown, San Francisco longshoreman and, according to committee information, the second-ranking Communist in the Northern California District; his official party post is district committee member in charge of trade union matters.

Ralph Izard, of San Francisco, active in Communist propaganda work in addition to serving on the San Francisco County Committee of the party.

Joseph Figueiredo, active party official in Massachusetts until his transfer to Northern California party activities. He served on the district committee of the party in 1957.

Saul Wachter, of Berkeley, active in the party's East Bay region Political Committee, according to the committee's information.

Douglas Wachter, student at the University of California and a leader in Communist work among youth.

Other witnesses subpenaed to appear before the committee on the basis of committee information respecting their leading roles in Northern California Communist echelons included the following in-

dividuals who, in every instance, invoked their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination and refused to answer pertinent questions: Merle Brodsky, Oakland; Noel Harris, Eureka; Ann Deirup, Berkeley; Elizabeth Nicholas, Sunnyvale; Donald H. Clark, San Jose; Morris Graham, San Jose; Sally Attarian Sweet, Hayward; Lillian Ransome, Wheatland; Ruben Venger, Cotati.

Six individuals employed as teachers were subpenaed before the committee on the basis of information that they have also been active in the Communst Party. Martin Irving Marcus, public school teacher of Pacific Grove; Lottie L. Rosen, teacher from Berkeley; Betty Halpern, a teacher in a Berkeley private school; and Travis Lafferty, Oakland teacher, invoked the fifth amendment when questioned regarding past and present Communist Party membership. Tillman H. Erb, a teacher at the Campbell School in Santa Clara County, California, stated he was willing to discuss his own activities but would not testify regarding others associated with him. When the committee did not agree to such qualifications, Mr. Erb declined to answer all questions concerning Communist Party activities on the ground of possible self-incrimination. John Allen Johnson, a high school mathematics teacher of Ukiah, California, also declared he had decided to "offer a certain degree of cooperation" to the committee by answering questions concerning his own associations but not those of other individuals. Claiming that disorderly demonstrations against the hearings had altered his plans, Mr. Johnson proceeded to respond to all questions by invoking the fifth amendment.

Two other witnesses with teacher training, but employed in other capacities, were called before the committee as a result of information that they have been affiliated with the Communist Party. Ralph Johnsen, of Berkeley, presently a machinist, admitted he had resigned as a teacher in 1950 rather than subscribe to loyalty oath requirements but had finally agreed to sign such an oath in 1958. He denied present party membership but invoked the fifth amendment when asked whether he had been a member prior to 1958. Louis Zeitz, a graduate student at Stanford University holding teaching credentials he has never used, invoked his constitutional privileges in response to all questions concerning Communist activity.

Karl Prussion, in a resumption of his testimony in Washington, D.C., on June 10, emphasized that the Communist Party is a party of Leninism and that party members, as disciples of Lenin, strive to bring about the prerequisite conditions that will make it possible for them to overthrow the Government by force and violence and set up a dictatorship of the Communist Party. Mr. Prussion outlined the four prerequisites of Communist revolution as follows:

1. The establishment of a dedicated Communist Party nucleus which is strong enough to lead an insurrection to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

2. Disunity in the Government of our Nation; dissension within the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government on vital current issues.

3. A chaotic economic situation in which the Communists, through their leadership in social, economic, and political organizations, could successfully carry out a revolution. This situation could be a depression or an inflationary spiral.

62224—60——5

4. The establishment of a trade-union movement which the Communists can successfully actuate into a political strike.

Mr. Prussion expressed the opinion that current Communist Party strength of approximately 10,000 hard-core, formal members, plus (his estimate) its equal number of secret members, is sufficient to carry out an insurrection "if the other prerequisites are attained."

He quoted as evidence for this belief a report by Communist Party official James S. Allen to the National Executive Committee of the party on May 9, 1958. In that report, Mr. Allen stated:

> Yet, in seeking to chart our road to socialism, we are in a much better position than the Marxists in the period before the Great Russian Revolution, which pioneered the road, or than we were before World War II, before a number of countries took that road.

Mr. Prussion explained that, to the Communists, all Communist Party activity is "revolutionary" in nature, whether it be in political, economic, or social organizations and even though, on the surface, it would appear to be "peaceful work within our Constitution and within our Bill of Rights."

Mr. Prussion gave examples of how the Communists are now working in the United States to achieve each of the four prerequisites of revolution, emphasizing in his testimony Communist methods of infiltrating various social, political, religious, and trade-union groups without arousing the groups' suspicions.

One such example was the Communist infiltration of the South Palo Alto Democratic Club. Mr. Prussion identified 14 of the 25 charter members of this club as persons known to him as Communist Party members.

He revealed how the Communists have used a campus group for student recruitment purposes. Of a Stanford University organization called Political Forum, Mr. Prussion stated:

> This organization is a good, bona fide organization. I don't believe it has any Communist control. They invite speakers of all descriptions from the extreme right to the extreme left.

The Communists, he pointed out, send several party members to the Political Forum meetings and they take note of those students who ask questions which lead the Communists to believe they would be good prospects for recruitment into the Communist Party:

> They befriend such a student and will invite such a student down to a social study group in one of the homes of the Communists.

In a similar way, Mr. Prussion testified, the Communists try to use PTA, religious and other grassroots community organizations to promote their line and to attempt to win additional converts to their cause.

In explaining the Communist "peace" appeal and campaign Mr. Prussion stated:

> The only peace that the Communist Party and the Communist International want is the "peace" that can come only through Communist triumph all over the world * * *.

Mr. Prussion revealed that the Communists in his area have held their secret meetings in members' homes, in public parks, and often

in public buildings. He recalled examples of secret Communist gatherings in the basement of the City Hall at Sunnyvale, Calif., the Community Center in Palo Alto, and the South Palo Alto Library:

> Even a room in the Civic Auditorium in San Jose has been used. * * *
>
> As a matter of fact, the Communists have a sense of humor and even their sense of humor has a class angle. When they refer to the Sunnyvale banquet room in the City Hall of Sunnyvale, they call it Smolny Institute No. 1 and they call the community building in Palo Alto Smolny Institute No. 2.

The Smolny Institute, he explained, was the Moscow headquarters of the Bolshevik Party during, prior to, and after the Russian Revolution.

Mr. Prussion also testified that persons known to him as Communist Party members have falsely signed affidavits that they were not members of any subversive organization in order to run for public office and school board positions.

He also stated that a Communist Party member, Michael Shapovalov, had written a book entitled "Soviet Union," which is being used in the public schools of San Mateo County "at the present time."

In evaluating what he considered to be the major weaknesses of the American public in regard to the operations of the Communist Party, Mr. Prussion stated:

> I think the Communist Party, especially through their peace campaign and their campaigns of peaceful coexistence, have had a major success in creating a public apathy and indifference to the menace of the Communist conspiracy. This apathy should be changed to an acute awareness by our citizenry of this danger, and this awareness should express itself in such a manner that there will be proper legislation passed that would facilitate the containment and the ultimate destruction of this conspiracy. Appeasement of the Soviet Union on their "peaceful coexistence offensive" today can only mean the complete capitulation of the American way of life to Leninist materialism and dictatorship tomorrow.

Continuing the committee's study into the entry of foreign Communist propaganda and its dissemination within the United States, the committee heard testimony in San Francisco from Irving Fishman, Deputy Collector of Customs in New York City.

Mr. Fishman reiterated the need for amendments to the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938. The act, according to Mr. Fishman, is directed primarily at forcing disclosure of those persons who act within the United States as propaganda agents of a foreign power. A second purpose of the act is to require the identification of political propaganda so that the American public can appraise and evaluate material disseminated by propaganda agents in the light of their foreign relationships.

Mr. Fishman estimated that in the year 1959 over 10 million individual propaganda items which had entered the United States from Soviet-bloc countries were submitted to his units throughout the country for examination. According to Mr. Fishman, the Foreign

Agents Registration Act does not, at the present time, appear to provide that this material be properly labeled at the time of importation.

A provision in the Foreign Agents Registration Act, as interpreted by the Attorney General in 1940, calls for establishment of an agency relationship between the sender and the foreign government before any action can be taken in connection with this propaganda. Mr. Fishman pointed out that this is difficult to prove when the Soviet propaganda machine directs to the United States material printed in, or sent through, other free countries of the world.

With the assistance of Mr. Stephen K. Louie and Mr. Harlin Wong, of the San Francisco office of the Customs Service, Mr. Fishman focused particular attention on the influx into California of Communist propaganda from the mainland of China and North Korea. After analyzing some of this material, Mr. Fishman stated that the Chinese Communists have concentrated on the overseas Chinese, with special attention to attracting overseas Chinese students for study in Red China. Mr. Fishman testified that the volume of propaganda produced in Europe for dissemination in this country has decreased while the Asian Communist material has been on the increase.

The committee completed its 3-day hearing in San Francisco under the most trying conditions possible. Identified Communists, sympathizers, and students, numbering in the hundreds, engaged in protest demonstrations within and outside the committee hearing chambers in a tragic sequence of events which culminated in outright rioting.

It is a matter of record that the Communist apparatus has decided that if its operations in the United States are to be more successful, it must intensify its campaign to get rid of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and at the same time try to discredit the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and generally weaken the F.B.I.'s influence and powers. At the time of the San Francisco hearings, this campaign was spearheaded by two Communist-front organizations, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC), with headquarters in New York, and the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms (CCPAF) on the West Coast.

One of the moving forces of the CCPAF is Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist whose job has been to incite resistance to and trouble for the committee in locations where hearings are scheduled. The CCPAF's "Operation Abolition" campaign against the committee was brought into San Francisco by Wilkinson, who freely admitted to newsmen covering the demonstrations that he was there to "organize protests."[1]

The long-time classic Communist tactic by which a relatively few well-trained, hard-core Communist agents are able to incite and use non-Communist sympathizers to perform the work of the Communist Party was again made evident in the San Francisco demonstrations.

[1] Since the hearings, a new national organization has been formed "to rid the country of the witch-hunting Un-American Activities Committee." This organization, the National Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee (NCAUAC), held its first meeting on October 10, 1960, in New York City. An announcement of this meeting gave the group's mailing address as 617 North Larchmont Boulevard, Los Angeles 4, California, which is the address of the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms (CCPAF).

Of the twelve national committee members of the NCAUAC, eight are currently officers or executive committee members of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. In addition, two of these serve simultaneously as executive officers of the CCPAF. Frank Wilkinson is the field representative of the NCAUAC. Eight key persons in the NCAUAC have been identified as members of the Communist Party.

Demonstrations within the hearing room on the first day of the hearing completely disrupted normal committee procedure time and time again and, at one point, forced a halt in the proceedings for over 40 minutes. The principal agitational demand of the Communist demonstrators and their followers was that the hearing room doors be opened so that more agitators could gain entry.

As film coverage of the hearing reveals, the committee, in an effort to be fair, had made every possible concession to those interested in viewing the proceedings. After every seat in the hearing room had been filled for the opening morning session, the committee, in violation of its normal procedure, permitted an additional 100 to 140 spectators to enter the room to view the proceedings while standing in the aisles and along the rear and side walls. The demonstrations were carried on in spite of this and, in order to put a stop to them and restore order, the chairman was forced to order evicted from the hearing room Archie Brown, Ralph Izard, Merle Brodsky, Saul Wachter, Morris Graham, Juanita Wheeler, Sally Attarian Sweet—all subpenaed witnesses and active Communists in the area, according to committee information. Several students were also ejected.

Because of this development, the aisles were cleared that afternoon and during the remaining 2 days of the hearings. However, a rotation seating procedure was adopted in an attempt to permit as many as possible of the spectators waiting in the hallways to observe the proceedings. Because the agitators engaged in repeated outbursts, demonstrations, and disruptive behavior in spite of this arrangement, the hearing room had to be carefully patrolled by police and sheriff's officials for the duration of the hearing.

On the second day of the hearing, the committee, at the request of the police and sheriff's department, had loudspeakers set up across the street from City Hall in an attempt to placate the crowds trying to gain entrance to the hearing room. (Due to the limited seating capacity only several hundred people could be admitted to the actual hearing room.)

As was the case on the previous day, several professional Communist agitators directed the activity of students and others waiting in the hallways. The demonstrators there became so loud that, after two judges in their chambers on the third floor had complained that they were unable to conduct court proceedings because of the noise, Presiding Superior Court Judge Clarence Morris, who had been experiencing the same difficulty, ordered the sheriff and police officials to clear the City Hall. When an attempt was made to carry out the order, rioting broke out. One student, according to the police officers on the scene, provided the spark that touched off the violence when he attacked a police officer with a night stick. In order to remove the demonstrators from City Hall, fire hoses had to be used.

Among those arrested during the riots were a few trained Communist agents. The others were the unwitting dupes of the party who had, in their demonstrations against the committee, performed like puppets—with the trained Communists manipulating the strings—even to the point of wilfully and deliberately defying law and order.

Thomas Cahill, Chief of Police; Michael J. Maguire, Police Inspector; and Matthew C. Carberry, Sheriff, all of the City and County of San Francisco, testified before this committee on the last day of

the hearings regarding the demonstrations and riots. Each of these men discussed their participation in the events just described. All of these officials agreed that the student demonstrators were infiltrated by a number of professional Communist agitators who were able to incite the students to riot. The committee praised these officials for exercising restraint, caution, and attention to the rights of all persons during the events which took place at the hearings.

The unprecedented disorder and violence surrounding the hearings led the committee to renew its appeal for legislation providing penalties for misbehavior before congressional committees. Communists and their dupes were able to disrupt committee hearings with virtual impunity. Under existing law, the committee cannot set in motion any type of judicial process aimed at punishing (and thereby also preventing) misbehavior which obstructs orderly congressional inquiry.

Immediately after the San Francisco hearings, the chairman of the committee introduced H.R. 12366, which would make it a misdemeanor for anyone to misbehave in the presence of either House of Congress or any one of their committees. The legislative proposal is discussed in detail in House Report 2228, submitted by the chairman of the committee to the House of Representatives. Film footage of the riots in San Francisco taken by TV stations KRON and KPIX of that city and made into a documentary film by Washington Video Productions, Inc., was made a part of this report.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES AMONG SEAMEN AND ON WATERFRONT FACILITIES, PART 1[1]

The committee held public hearings on Communist activities among seamen and on waterfront facilities in Washington, D.C., on June 6, 7, 8, and 23, 1960.

These hearings were held to develop information that would enable the committee to appraise the bill, H.R. 11580, which was introduced in the House on April 5, 1960, by the committee chairman and referred to the committee for investigation, study, hearings, and report.[2] If enacted, H.R. 11580 would amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide that no individual who wilfully fails or refuses to answer, or falsely answers, certain questions relating to Communist activities when summoned to appear before certain Federal agencies would be employed on any United States merchant vessel or within certain waterfront facilities in the United States.

The need for such legislation was aptly illustrated by the chairman in his opening statement to the committee, when he said:

> In *Parker* v. *Lester*, decided October 26, 1955, and in *Graham* v. *Richmond*, decided November 5, 1959, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, respectively, following a series of decisions by the Supreme Court, for all practical purposes ruled invalid the entire security screening procedures administered by the United States Coast Guard. Prior to these decisions, under the Merchant Marine screening program

[1] See "Communist Activities Among Seamen and on Waterfront Facilities," Part 1, June 6, 7, 8, and 23, 1960, Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities.
[2] See Chapter VIII, "Legislative Recommendations," p. 136.

which had been authorized by law in 1950, the United States Coast Guard had screened off over 1,800 seamen from merchant vessels. Since these court decisions and subsequent rulings following them by the Federal district courts, hundreds of seamen who had been screened off merchant vessels as security risks have procured seamen's documents.

The chairman explained the origin of the bill introduced by him, as follows:

> This bill is patterned after a California statute which was held valid by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Nelson and Globe* v. *County of Los Angeles*, decided February 29, 1960. In this case, the Supreme Court examined a provision of the California code which made it the duty of any public employee when summoned before an appropriate Government agency to give the information of which he was possessed on communism and other subversive activity. The California code provides for dismissal of any such public employee who fails or refuses to appear or to answer the questions propounded.
>
> In sustaining the validity of the California statute, the court found that, notwithstanding the public employee's invocation of the fifth amendment, his refusal to reply to the questions propounded was sufficient basis for his discharge because the State may legitimately predicate discharge on refusal of a public employee to give information touching on the field of security.
>
> My bill not only attempts to deal with the problems of Communists on vessels, but also a related area in which it would appear that legislation is needed, namely, on waterfront facilities which, if in the hands of Communists or if penetrated by Communist agents, would create a grave threat to our internal security.

During the course of the hearings, the committee heard testimony from 22 witnesses. Included in this number were representatives of the United States Coast Guard, shipping companies, union officials, and seamen.

Vice Admiral James A. Hirshfield, assistant commandant of the Coast Guard, accompanied by the assistant chief of the Merchant Marine Personnel Division and the chief counsel and assistant chief counsel of the Coast Guard, reviewed the history of the merchant seamen screening program, the impact of various court decisions on that program, and the need for the legislation under consideration by this committee. He pointed out that approximately 1,800 seamen who had been denied seamen's papers by the Coast Guard as security risks, are, pursuant to recent court decisions, now eligible on application to be issued seamen's papers.

Respecting the threat to the internal security of the United States posed by Communists on ships or waterfront facilities, Admiral Hirshfield stated:

> Anyone familiar with the work of men who follow the sea must agree with the conclusion of the Court as expressed in *Parker* v. *Lester* that merchant seamen are in a sensitive

> position in that opportunities for serious sabotage are numerous. Furthermore, because of the very nature of their occupation, seamen may be used easily as links in a worldwide Communist communication system and a worldwide espionage network.

In testifying about the security threat posed by Communist seamen and Communists on waterfront facilities, Rear Admiral Halert C. Shepheard described the extent to which the United States is dependent upon its merchant fleet. He stated that the country has recognized the merchant fleet as the fourth arm of its defense. Admiral Shepheard, prior to his retirement, was chief of the Office of Merchant Marine Safety of the United States Coast Guard.

Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., which represents 45 American shipping companies, appeared as a witness and testified in support of H.R. 11580, the bill under consideration by the committee.

Ray R. Murdock, Washington counsel, Seafarers' International Union of North America, accompanied by H. Howard Ostrin, general counsel, National Maritime Union, and Hoyt S. Haddock, director, Seafarers' Section, Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, offered additional testimony supporting the bill introduced by the chairman.

Respecting the existing situation in which the Coast Guard screening program has been ruled invalid by the Federal courts, Mr. Murdock stated:

> The result is that subversives have free access to ships and port facilities in this country.

He continued:

> Let me emphasize that, under existing conditions, the shipping industry constitutes a convenient conduit by which subversives from foreign countries can pour into this country. The dangers inherent in this situation cannot be overemphasized. The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences recently issued a report known as "Project Walrus." We do not agree with some of the conclusions in this report. However, it does set forth some facts which should be alarming to the Congress and to the public.
>
> It points out that, in the event of general war, "merchant shipping is very likely to be the least damaged physical resource." This is because railroad and highway systems are extremely vulnerable to atomic attack. In the event of such an attack, our main reliance, at least in the early stages, would be on the merchant marine.
>
> But it must be remembered that the merchant marine is peculiarly vulnerable to sabotage. One skilled man can paralyze a great ship. If we are not able to prevent the infiltration of our merchant marine by subversives, then the hazards become incalculable. If our merchant marine can be paralyzed by sabotage, then all the billions we are spending for defense still leave us woefully unprepared.

He and his associates supported H.R. 11580 but suggested that it be amended to cover seamen employed on any merchant vessel owned by a citizen of the United States.

Marion Chrusniak, president, Local 829, International Longshoremen's Association, Baltimore, testified on behalf of the 5,000 longshoremen from the port of Baltimore in support of the chairman's bill. He also pointed out the threat posed by Communist activities on waterfront facilities.

Shea Gorden Trosten, of Bridgeport, Connecticut, an instrument worker who had been an active seaman for about 12 years, testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1943 to 1951 and that for about 7 years prior to his appearance before this committee he had served as an undercover informant within the party for the FBI. While in the Communist Party, he said, he had been a rank-and-file member of its Waterfront Sections in New York City and Port Arthur, Texas, and had attended party Waterfront Section meetings in New Orleans and in England, Belgium, and France. He had also attended the Communist Party's Jefferson School of Social Science in New York City and had been a member of the National Maritime Union.

Mr. Trosten testified that the major activities of Communist seamen were directed toward getting Communist Party members elected to positions of influence in maritime unions and in carrying out Communist Party policy aboard ship.

He also testified that Communists carried American Communist Party propaganda to Europe, where they delivered it to party contacts. It was common practice, he said, for Communist cell meetings to be held aboard ships.

When asked how Communist seamen could be used for the smuggling of couriers or espionage agents, Mr. Trosten replied:

> It is not too difficult to cover a man up on a passenger ship where you have a crew of about 600 or 700, like the *United States* or the *America* or the *Constitution*. You find them in the steward's department, and he can ride over and back with practically no detection by anybody, because there are so many aboard.

Mr. Trosten identified a number of seamen known by him to be members of the Communist Party.

Loron Whitney Wardwell, of Rochester, New York, a chef, testified that he had served in the merchant marine as chief steward, chief cook and second cook, and butcher and baker from 1945 to 1953, at which time he was expelled from his union as a "left-winger" when it was taken over by the American Federation of Labor. He also testified that he had been a member of the Waterfront Section of the Communist Party from 1949 to 1953, and served as an informant for the FBI from 1950–1954.

Mr. Wardwell testified that it was an extremely serious threat to national security for Communists to have access to merchant vessels and port facilities, that they could tie up waterfronts and could also serve as a "perfect front" for Communist courier services to Europe and the Far East at any time.

He testified that Communist Party propaganda was distributed on every ship he had ever worked on and that members of the Waterfront Section of the Communist Party were under instructions to—

> take complete control of unions, various committees, to disrupt various organizations and to, I would say, create havoc on the waterfront.

Mr. Wardwell testified that he had known two or three hundred seamen who were Communist Party members. He identified as Communists a number of seamen who had been screened off American merchant ships under the Coast Guard security program and who had recently been reissued seamen's papers as a result of court decisions. Two of the persons identified by Mr. Wardwell, Peter Goodman and Stanley Milton Hauser, appeared before this committee during the course of the hearings.

Peter Goodman, of New York, testified that he had been a plastic moldmaker for the last 5 years. He invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to testify if he was presently a member of the Communist Party and if he currently held seaman's papers. He also invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to testify whether witness Loron Wardwell's identification of him as a Communist Party member was true, whether he had told those attending a meeting of the Youth Against the House Un-American Activities Committee held at the Woodstock Hotel in New York City on June 3, 1960, that he was not a member of the Communist Party, and whether, in addressing that meeting, he had expressed the hope that demonstrations against the committee during the instant hearings would exceed those which took place in San Francisco. During the course of his testimony the following excerpt from the speech he delivered at the Woodstock Hotel was introduced into the record:

> Some of us who have carried this fight over a period of time have learned not to stand in the way of history. We expect to get ourselves back into the industry—reestablish ourselves—and in the long run I think that the maritime industry is meant to be one of the militant sparkplugs of the labor movement as it was in time gone by.

There was displayed to Mr. Goodman a document from the United States Coast Guard certifying that he had procured seaman's papers, but Mr. Goodman refused to answer any questions concerning the document.

Stanley Milton Hauser, a student at the City College of New York, also invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he was presently a member of the Communist Party and if he held papers as a ship's radio operator. After witness Loron Wardwell identified Hauser as a person known to him as a Communist Party member and a member of the goon squad of the Waterfront Section of the Communist Party of New York City, Hauser invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to affirm or deny these identifications. He also invoked constitutional privileges when asked if he had ever transmitted radio messages at the direction of a person known to him to be a member of the Communist Party.

There was displayed to Mr. Hauser a document from the United States Coast Guard certifying that he had been issued seaman's papers in 1957, but Mr. Hauser refused to answer any questions concerning the document.

Hugh Mulzac, of Jamaica, New York, who commanded a Liberty ship in World War II, invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he was currently a member of the Communist Party, if he had been screened off merchant vessels in the past under the Coast Guard security program, and if he had made arrangements to resume his career as a seaman. Mulzac had had his seaman's papers as a steward-cook returned to him in 1956 as a result of the decisions by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

He also invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he was chairman of the Seamen's Defense Committee. The Seamen's Defense Committee was described in an article appearing in the Daily Worker of March 5, 1956, as follows:

> The Seamen's Defense Committee, composed chiefly of seamen and longshoremen who have been screened out of the maritime industry by the Coast Guard, was formed recently with the cooperation of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.[1]

Mr. Mulzac's connection with the Seamen's Defense Committee was described in a Daily Worker article of November 8, 1956, as follows:

> The Seamen's Defense Committee Against Coast Guard Screening, whose chairman is Capt. Hugh N. Mulzac, and consisting of merchant seamen denied "clearance" within the last six years by the Coast Guard * * *.

Mr. Mulzac refused, on fifth-amendment grounds, to answer any questions pertaining to these Daily Worker articles.

The following individuals appeared before the committee during this hearing and invoked constitutional privileges in response to questions regarding Communist Party membership: Donald William Jackson, Rudolf Kaunitz, Louis Becker, Henry Bernard Kasbohm, Charles Malvern Swan, William Henry Thompson, and Charles Everett Colcord.

The above-mentioned witnesses were named to this committee by Coast Guard officials as seamen whose papers had previously been denied them but who presently hold seamen's papers as a result of recent court decisions.

William Henry Thompson, a seaman from Baltimore, invoked constitutional privileges when asked if he had been in the offices of the Committee on Un-American Activities the previous day, had conferred with the staff director at that time, had told the director something of his background, and revealed that he had recently broken with the Communist Party. In addition, he invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he had planned to testify before the committee as a cooperative witness, if he had been threatened since his visit to the committee offices the previous day, and if he had told any person he knew to be a Communist Party member about his visit to the committee office and his plan to testify. There was displayed to Mr. Thompson a document from the United States Coast Guard certifying that he had procured seamen's papers, but Mr. Thompson refused to answer any questions concerning the document.

---

[1] See Committee on Un-American Activities Annual Report for the Year 1958, H. Rept. 187, March 8, 1959, pp. 34, 35, in which the committee formally found the ECLC to be a Communist front.

COMMUNIST PENETRATION OF RADIO FACILITIES (CONELRAD—COMMUNICATIONS)—Part 1[1]

Communists licensed as radio operators with access to radio transmitting equipment could "wreak havoc" on the defense system of this Nation through sabotage of CONELRAD, various electronics devices, and our radar net, according to Air Force Major Dow E. Evelyn in testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities on August 24, 1960.

Committee hearings on August 23 and 24 were designed to develop information pertinent to H.R. 12852, a bill which had been introduced in the Congress by Mr. Walter and referred to this committee.[2] This bill would amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to cope with Communist infiltration in the field of radio communications. It not only prohibits the issuance of a radio operator's license to any individual who wilfully fails or refuses to answer certain questions relating to Communist activities when summoned to appear before designated Federal agencies, but also provides for the revocation of a license which may be, or may have been, issued to such an individual.

The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia handed down its decision in the case of *Borrow* v. *Federal Communications Commission* on June 30, 1960.

The court held that under the Communications Act it was proper for the Commission to ask an applicant for a license certain questions pertaining to Communist Party membership and that refusal to answer such questions was sufficient basis for the Commission to dismiss an application. This case, however, did not deal with holders of operators' licenses, as distinct from applicants.

It was brought out in the hearing that approximately 2½ million individuals hold FCC transmitting licenses and that, under the present law, Communists are not precluded, as such, from holding or obtaining a communications license. The FCC, however, if it has evidence of Communist Party membership on the part of an applicant, can set a hearing and deny a license to said applicant on the ground that it would be contrary to public interest.

Eleven witnesses testified to the need for effective security legislation in the communications field. The witnesses were representatives of the Federal Communications Commission, the Air Force, private industry engaged in communications, and the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

The first witness, Robert E. Lee, commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, was accompanied by four of his associates on the Commission staff who assisted him in his testimony.

The Federal Communications Commission was created in 1934. Its purpose is to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in communications by wire and radio. Everyone who operates a radio transmitter, with the exception of the military or Federal Government, must apply to FCC for a license and must meet certain public-interest standards. This holds whether they are amateur, police, conservation, airplane, or ships' radio operators.

The FCC representatives explained that CONELRAD (a contraction of CONtrol of ELectromagnetic RADiation) was developed

---

[1] See "Communist Penetration of Radio Facilities (CONELRAD—Communications), Part 1, Aug. 23 and 24, 1960, Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities.

[2] See section of this report dealing with "Legislative Recommendations," p. 136.

by FCC at the request of the military and civil defense officials. Military officials had asked for some means of denying radiation from any transmitter which would, under attack conditions, provide navigational aid to an enemy. Civil defense, on the other hand, wanted a means of communication to the public under attack conditions. Mr. Lee said that CONELRAD is a compromise system and not perfect for either purpose, but that, at present, it is the only practicable solution to the problem and a must for national defense. He also pointed out that CONELRAD is a protection against intereference with the operations of U.S. defensive and offensive missiles in the event of enemy attack.

During a CONELRAD alert, Mr. Lee explained, approximately 1300 stations remain on the air in a prearranged, engineered system, broadcasting on 640 and 1240 kilocycles. They are not permitted to identify their location, their power is reduced, and they broadcast only civil defense information. He estimated that there would be as many as 4,500 radio operators involved in the system, depending on the number of shifts during an alert.

According to Mr. Lee, a station which disobeyed CONELRAD directives and remained on the air under attack conditions, without shifting to the designated frequencies, could provide navigational aid to approaching aircraft and also provide intelligence information to the enemy. He said that he is, and always has been, deeply concerned over attempts by Communists to penetrate communications facilities of this Nation.

Mr. Lee told the committee that FCC cannot deny or revoke an operator's license without a full hearing. When the Commission receives confidential derogatory information from another Government agency concerning a current license holder, he said, it must consider whether it will be able to prove its case in a hearing. When, for security reasons, a witness cannot be produced, the FCC has no choice but to renew the license.

The witness said that it was his personal opinion that H.R. 12852 would be a "useful tool" in attempting to preclude Communists from access to communications facilities.

He also pointed out that, in spite of the ruling in the Borrow case, the FCC has no specific legal authorization for sending a questionnaire concerning Communist Party activity to persons who apply for renewal of their licenses and that there have been relatively few instances in which the Commission has been able to deny a license renewal by reason of confidential information regarding Communist Party membership and activities.

Mr. Frank M. Kratokvil, assistant chief of the Field Engineering and Monitoring Bureau, FCC, described the license status of a number of individuals who had obtained radio operators' licenses from the FCC and who were under subpena to appear before the committee.

The next witness was Michael Mignon, a former Communist Party member who had appeared before the committee in 1957 under subpena and testified concerning his experiences and activities as a member of the Communist Party from 1936 to approximately 1940. At the hearing in August 1960, Mr. Mignon, also under subpena and now a representative of the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, testified that he had known radio operator Philip D. Boothroyd as a member of the Communist Party on the West Coast. He also testified that, on the basis of his background in both the Communist Party and

the communications industry, it was his opinion that a Communist Party member who had access to communications facilities "would not hesitate at all" to sabotage CONELRAD.

Major Dow E. Evelyn, of the Office of Directorate of Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, testified that the Air Force regards CONELRAD as important and that, in March 1959, it had restated its need as a military requirement. Major Evelyn pointed out that in addition to providing navigational aid to the enemy, a person who chose to disobey the CONELRAD directive could also give false or misleading instructions to the civilian populace, thereby causing panic.

For security reasons, Major Evelyn avoided technical details regarding defense systems, but he did explain that protective electronic devices, including the radar net of the United States, are dependent upon the intelligence they collect, and the possibility exists that the system may be blinded through the use of false, spurious, or masking signals.

Major Evelyn testified that the Air Force has no power to cause the removal of Communists who have access to radio transmitters.

Wilson McMakin, vice president of the Mackay Radio and Telegraph Co., the Commercial Cable Co., and All America Cables and Radio, Inc., and Globe Wireless, Ltd.—all subsidiaries of the American Cable and Radio Corporation—appeared as a witness in the hearing. Mr. McMakin, in addition to holding the above-mentioned positions, is director of industrial relations for these companies, as well as their industrial personnel security officer.

He testified that his companies operate radio-telegraph and submarine cable telegraph circuits to and from most countries of the world, including the Soviet Union and other nations behind the Iron Curtain. These circuits, which handle all types of international traffic, are used not only by the public, but by Government agencies and American firms engaged in defense work.

In addition, Mr. McMakin stated, the companies operate public coastal radio stations on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific Coasts of the United States. These stations are engaged in communications with all ships at sea, including American-flag ships.

The operators handling the messages at the coastal stations, as well as aboard ship, are all licensed by the FCC. To insure proper routing of marine messages, they, of necessity, must and do have knowledge of the location of all ships at sea in all oceans. It is easy, he said, to see the danger posed by subversives in such positions in time of a national emergency.

Mr. McMakin stated that it was his belief that the possibility of sabotage in the communications area was the "greatest danger to national defense":

> Trained saboteurs planted throughout the communications companies' facilities could cause a breakdown of such facilities * * *.
>
> It would be a simple matter for such employees to cripple communications by damaging delicate and complex equipment used in modern methods of transmission.

He said that his companies endorsed H.R. 12852—

> as an important means to help prevent the deliberate placement of the saboteur and the spy in critical locations throughout an industry as vital to the national defense as international communications.

Joseph F. Keating, vice president in charge of programs and operations for the Mutual Broadcasting System and a member of the National Industry Advisory Committee, testified that NIAC has been working with FCC in developing a plan for an emergency broadcasting system to function before, during, and after a CONELRAD radio alert.

The NIAC plan will utilize CONELRAD stations for broadcasting Presidential messages, general instructions, news, and various other messages from relocated agencies of the Federal Government.

It seems obvious, Mr. Keating stated—

> that Communist agents or sympathizers, placed in vital areas, could play havoc with this system under CONELRAD. The emergency broadcast system's success depends upon the collaboration of every station involved, including * * * even amateur radio stations.

He pointed out that just a few persons could cause damage and destruction, even though the vast majority of radio personnel and technicians were completely loyal and cooperative.

Mr. Keating emphasized the need for effective legislation to help safeguard the American radio system from sabotage at the hands of Communists or Communist agents.

In addition to the witnesses who testified to the need for legislation to help protect our communications facilities from subversion and sabotage, six individuals who, according to the committee information, are or have been members of the Communist Party appeared in response to subpena.

These witnesses have all held, and in some instances still hold, licenses issued to them by the Federal Communications Commission which enable them to operate communications facilities.

Two of the witnesses, Philip D. Boothroyd and Wayne P. Paschal, have been publicly identified as members of the Communist Party by witnesses appearing before this committee. Both invoked the fifth amendment and refused to either affirm or deny the testimony given concerning them. They also refused to answer questions pertaining to current party membership.

Witnesses Harold O. Townsend, Stanley Blumenthal, Murray Goldberg, and David Jay Gould also invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer questions pertaining to present Communist Party membership.

TESTIMONY OF CAPTAIN NIKOLAI FEDOROVICH ARTAMONOV[1]

"Since February 1955, Soviet strategy has been based on the doctrine of surprise attack in nuclear warfare. * * * Several times over the past 4 years, it has been said again and it has never been changed."

This ominous statement was made in testimony before the committee on September 14 by Nikolai Fedorovich Artamonov, a 32-year-old native of Leningrad and former Soviet Naval officer who defected to the West in June 1959. Captain Artamonov also declared:

> I believe that the Soviet dictatorship would undertake a surprise attack if she felt that she could win in one stroke. Make no mistake—they are power seekers, not political idealists. Khrushchev does not wish to wait indefinitely for the

[1] See "Testimony of Captain Nikolai Fedorovich Artamonov (Former Soviet Naval Officer)," Sept. 14, 1960, Hearing before Committee on Un-American Activities.

United States to become a socialist state by evolution; moreover he does not believe this will happen. He would like to see it take place in his lifetime.

The Captain testified that, although he did not have access to any secret information or directives concerning a surprise nuclear attack on the United States by the Soviet Government, he did know of a number of broad official statements which were intended to prepare the military forces of the USSR for the possibility of unleashing such an attack on this country. He produced a Soviet military publication which dealt with that very subject.

Captain Artamonov said he felt obliged to point out that "Soviet military strategy is inconsistent with Khrushchev's pronouncements on disarmament."

Since his arrival in the United States, Captain Artamonov testified, he has tried to draw upon his knowledge and experience to help the West meet the threats of the Soviet Government.

He stated that while he knew that Soviet submarines sailing in or close to United States territorial waters were seeking information of interest to Moscow's intelligence organizations, he was in a position to discuss Soviet trawler activity in more detail. According to the witness, these trawlers are part of a Soviet Naval Intelligence Squadron, are manned by special crews selected from Naval Intelligence personnel and constitute an essential part of the Soviet Naval fleet. The trawlers, he said, are not the fishing vessels they purport to be, but are equipped with special instruments for collecting intelligence data. For deceptive purposes, they carry a load of fish when they leave their bases to carry out their intelligence missions in or close to the territorial waters of the United States or in other areas.

Captain Artamonov testified that the trawlers' mission is to collect information concerning the combat readiness and preparations of American naval forces, the composition and structure of the fleet, the various types of weapons carried by our vessels, and the routes of our naval and air patrols. Captain Artamonov said that our antisubmarine defenses are "of great interest" to Soviet Naval Intelligence.

The chairman revealed that Captain Artamonov had, on a number of occasions before his defection, been singled out for special attention and commendation in the Soviet press. He said that articles appearing in various Soviet publications praised Captain Artamonov for his outstanding performance and leadership, for having achieved a very high degree of competence in antisubmarine training, and for his proficiency in propagandizing party decisions among his officers and men. The chairman pointed out that, under the Soviet system, these articles could be considered a great tribute to the Captain.

"Listening to this young man's statements about the Soviet military and political intentions, strategy, capabilities, Soviet espionage, and the present lot of the Soviet citizen," the chairman said, "we are reminded again of the aggressive and deceitful threat to world peace the Soviet Union represents."

Captain Artamonov testified that he was born and educated in Russia and that his entire life had been that of a true Soviet citizen.

Recalling his political background, the Captain testified that, as a child, he belonged to the "Pioneers," a Communist organization for children which he compared with our Boy Scouts. However, he said, in the Soviet Union usual scouting activities were displaced largely by political indoctrination and propaganda. During his teens, Captain Artamonov said, he was a member of the Komsomol (Young Communist League), which he described as an "organization for adolescents, youths of older age groups and * * * much more seriously concerned with ideas aimed at forming good Communists." In 1947, he reached the status of candidate for Communist Party membership and, in 1949, became a full-fledged member of the party.

Captain Artamonov testified that his presence in the United States was due to the "Kremlin's policies" and that his defection was not prompted by foreign intelligence agents or by the prospect of an easier life:

> I did not come to the United States because of any connections with foreign intelligence—for I had none; nor did I make this move because of threats of repercussions for something I had done—for there were none. On the contrary, I was given favored treatment by the Soviet authorities and had a bright future ahead of me—having been publicly described as one of the brilliant young career officers of the Soviet Navy. My defection was also not prompted by the prospect of greater material gain or security or an easy life, for I gave up what promised to be a successful career in the Soviet Union to come here.

In his testimony, Captain Artamonov revealed that he first began to doubt the Soviet system while he was a student at Higher Naval School. Later, questions were raised in his mind as a result of observations made during his cruises to various foreign ports, although, initially, "Soviet propaganda and political education managed to quiet them * * *." However, he said, the Hungarian revolution and the unrest in Poland in 1956 finally convinced him that the Soviet Government's foreign policy statements were untrue. When Khrushchev praised Marshal Zhukov as a war hero and 3 months later fired him, Captain Artamonov's illusions about internal policies were completely shattered. He could no longer spread ideologies which he had come to detest.

The captain emphasized that he will never forsake the Russian people, for he is and shall remain a Russian—"but not a Soviet Russian, not a toy in the hands of Khrushchev and the company in the Kremlin."

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The committee held a number of executive session hearings on the defection to the Soviet Union of Bernon F. Mitchell and William H. Martin, National Security Agency mathematicians and cryptographers. The committee's investigation of this defection is continuing and further hearings on it will be held.

62224—60——6

A report containing as much information on the matter as may be made public consistent with the interest of national security may be published by the committee in the future.

The committee is presently making an extensive study of security regulations and practices now in force in sensitive Government agencies. It believes that this study, when completed, will point up the necessity for more realistic administration of personnel security measures in all such agencies in the future.

CHAPTER III

REPORTS

COMMUNIST TARGET—YOUTH

Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics

The student riots against the Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco, California, May 13, 1960, were Communist-inspired and Communist-incited. This was the report of J. Edgar Hoover,[1] Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the committee. Mr. Hoover said that the riots were termed "the most successful Communist coup to occur in the San Francisco area in 25 years" by experienced West Coast observers familiar with Communist strategy and tactics.

As background for his report, Mr. Hoover referred to Communist manipulation of youth in other parts of the world, specifically mentioning demonstrations by Communist-oriented students in Uruguay earlier in 1960 and the Japanese riots, which he described as the "culmination" of the Communists' nurturing and developing of students over a 10-year period. He also described how youth groups in Cuba are being exploited by Communists to "strengthen the revolution" in that country.

During the last 2 years in the United States, the Communist Party has achieved a limited "breakthrough" in its efforts to infiltrate youth and student groups. This, Mr. Hoover said, has been the result of careful planning and concentrated effort by the party.

He revealed that on May 30 and 31, 1959, a meeting took place in New York City attended by some 20 young party leaders from all over the country:

> The purpose of the meeting was to devise a program to attract young blood—teenagers, students, and working youth—to the ranks of the party.

Following this meeting, the party began a series of lecture programs throughout the country and placed "two of the most promising and active young Communists, Mortimer Daniel Rubin and Danny Queen," on the party's National Committee. In addition, a new Marxist youth organization, Advance, was organized and plans were formulated for a new Marxist youth publication, "New Horizons."[2] Mr. Hoover stated that this publication would not be labeled a Marxist publication, so as to avoid too close identification with the Communist Party.

---

[1] See "Communist Target—Youth: Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics," a report by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, illustrating Communist strategy and tactics in the rioting which occurred during House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings, San Francisco, May 12–14, 1960.

[2] Now being published under the title "New Horizons For Youth."

Many youth and student groups in our country today are "totally unaware" of the extent to which they can be victimized by the Communist Party, according to Mr. Hoover. As an example, he pointed out that Judge Albert A. Axelrod of the San Francisco municipal court had dismissed charges against 62 of the persons arrested for their part in the San Francisco riots, even though there were ample grounds for conviction, because he felt that the young people could well be haunted for the rest of their lives by the stigma which conviction would attach to them. Yet, immediately after this decision had been rendered, 58 of the defendants signed and distributed a statement claiming: "Nobody incited us, nobody misguided us. We were led by our own convictions and we still stand firmly by them."

In line with a long-standing party aim to destroy not only the Committee on Un-American Activities, but also the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the Communist Party had reaffirmed its dedication to "abolish" these two investigative committees in a resolution adopted at its 17th National Convention in December 1959.

Thus, according to Mr. Hoover, when the decision of the Committee on Un-American Activities to hold hearings May 12–14, 1960, in San Francisco was announced, it was mandatory for Communists to implement the convention resolution by "doing everything possible to disrupt the hearings as part of the overall aim to destroy the HCUA."

Mr. Hoover recalled that a concentrated effort had been made by various groups in the San Francisco area to force cancellation of HCUA hearings into Communist activities of educators in northern California scheduled for June 1959. The subsequent cancellation of these hearings left many of the protesting groups and organizations inactive but intact and, because of this, reorganization and reactivation for the 1960 call to action against the committee was aided immensely.

For the 1960 hearings, the Communists planned two stages of attack. The first was to pack the hearings with demonstrators. The second was to incite these demonstrators to "action" through the use of mob psychology.

In organizing the first stage of attack, the Communist Party decided to build support around one of the subpenaed witnesses, Douglas Wachter, an 18-year-old sophomore at the University of California who had attended the Seventeenth National Convention of the Communist Party. According to Mr. Hoover, Douglas Wachter proceeded to organize student demonstrators on his campus immediately after he had been served with a subpena.

Roscoe Proctor, a member of the district committee of the Northern California District of the Communist Party, was instructed by the district chairman, Mickey Lima, to contact additional students at the University of California and enlist their support. Lima was also assured that student support would be forthcoming from Santa Rosa Junior College and San Francisco State College.

A circular to all Communists in the San Francisco area outlined the plan of attack, and rank-and-file party members quickly responded. Party members immediately circulated petitions, published protest advertisements, initiated fund drives, and arranged for radio broadcasts to stimulate resistance to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

A party telephone campaign, designed specifically to reach 1,000 people, solidified party action. Mr. Hoover pointed out that Merle

Brodsky, an active leader of the Communist Party in California for 20 years, "boasted that he was calling everyone he had ever known enlisting support for the demonstrations."

Mr. Hoover added that a simultaneous campaign was initiated by various Communist-controlled groups in the area, including the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms and the East Bay Community Forum. These organizations, financially assisted by the Communist Party, circulated literature opposing the committee and calling for its abolition. Mr. Hoover added:

> As the scheduled time for the hearings neared, Communists stepped up their efforts to assure a big turnout. Communist leaders in Berkeley arranged transportation from Berkeley to San Francisco for youths interested in attending each of the 3-day hearings. Meetings were held; leaflets appeared on campuses; and telephone calls were made with increasing urgency.
>
> By May 11, 1960, party leaders knew they had succeeded in the first stage of their planned campaign. * * * the demonstrators would be out in full force.

Simultaneously, the party initiated plans to carry out the second stage of their planned attack. Mr. Hoover quoted one of the subpenaed witnesses, Saul Wachter, as saying to party members that the committee would encounter "plenty of opposition" and that demonstrations would be staged against the committee.

He added that Archie Brown, a former member of the party's National Committee, and Merle Brodsky planned physical outbursts during the hearings "so that they would be forcibly ejected and thus enabled to play on the sympathies of the students."

Party officials gave explicit orders to various witnesses as to how to behave before the committee. Mr. Hoover revealed that on May 6, 1960, Mickey Lima told party members he had met with Leibel Bergman, Andy Negro, and Vern Bown to insure that they would be hostile witnesses.

In addition, the party intended to have an approved document read into the record for future party use by Juanita Wheeler, another subpenaed party member.

Final arrangements included the distribution of additional pamphlets, preparation of posters and placards for the demonstrators to carry, and a party-sponsored "Peace March" on Saturday, May 14, 1960, at the conclusion of the hearings.

Mr. Hoover stated that the well-organized plan of attack unfolded according to schedule as the hearings began. Archie Brown and Merle Brodsky were so contemptuous in their behavior inside the hearing room that they were forcibly ejected. Mr. Hoover continued: "An organized clique of sympathizers in the hearing room aided them in their roles. * * * Approximately 25 percent of the spectators in the room were individuals under subpena and their relatives, friends, attorneys, and sympathizers." These people provided vocal support for the 36 uncooperative witnesses as they unleashed their bitter attacks against the committee during interrogation.

Mr. Hoover added that during the luncheon recess on May 12, Brown and Brodsky again incited a demonstration inside the hearing room.

They seized a microphone and demanded that all spectators outside the room be admitted. This received the support of the sympathetic clique within the room, and finally Brown, Brodsky, and several others had to be forcibly ejected from the room when they refused to obey orders to be seated.

Mr. Hoover added:

> Brown's plan to incite the crowd was beginning to materialize. Upon his ejection from the hearing room, sympathetic cheers went up from the crowd, consisting mostly of students, gathered inside City Hall at the head of the staircase leading to the room.

Although police were able, for the most part, to maintain law and order on the first day of the hearings, a larger crowd appeared on the scene the second day.

Mr. Hoover stated, "A particularly noticeable aspect of the increase was the presence of additional party members and former party members."

A municipal court judge in the City Hall ordered that the building be cleared because the noisy demonstrators made it impossible for him to hold court. When police officials attempted to enforce this judicial ruling, the crowds responded by "throwing shoes and jostling the officers," according to Mr. Hoover's report.

Police warned the mob that fire hoses would be turned on if it did not disperse in obedience to the judge's order. The mob, instigated by strategically placed Communists, refused to move.

According to Mr. Hoover's report:

> One of the demonstrators provided the spark that touched off the flame of violence. Leaping a barricade that had been erected, he grabbed an officer's night stick and began beating the officer over the head. The mob surged forward as if to storm the doors, and a Police Inspector ordered the fire hose turned on. The water forced the crowd to the head of the balustrade, and the cold water had a sobering effect on the emotions of the demonstrators.

During a brief lull in the rioting, police officers removed some of the resisting demonstrators from the building:

> Suddenly, realizing what was happening, militant individuals in the group set the pattern for renewed violence by kicking and striking the officers.

The third day of the hearings, Mr. Hoover reported, saw more threatened violence, as a crowd of about 2,000 gathered at the scene. A party attorney from Oakland, Bertram Edises, incited further resistance to the committee when he became so arrogant and insulting in his appearance as a witness before the committee that he had to be removed from the hearing room.

Committee members were escorted out of the building as the suddenly aroused crowd surged toward the entrance of City Hall and toward policemen assigned to maintain law and order.

In evaluating the demonstrations and riots against the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Hoover stated:

> The Communist Party, USA, is elated with the success it enjoyed in attempting to make a fiasco of the HCUA San Francisco hearings, which, notwithstanding these attempts at disruption, did develop valuable and needed information concerning the strategy, tactics, and activities of the party in northern California.

Several factors pleased the party particularly. First, the number of students that the Communists had been able to recruit for "action." Secondly, the number of former party members the affair had brought back into the ranks of the party. Thirdly, the beneficial effect the demonstrations had had upon various Communist functions, such as a fund drive for the party's West Coast publication, People's World, which reportedly received much supporting mail from individuals throughout the United States and the world.

Mr. Hoover wrote:

> In short the consensus in the Communist Party was that the riot was the best thing for the party that had occurred in years. * * * The feeling was that not only had the party taken a major step toward its goal of abolishing the HCUA, but also it had taken a major step toward playing a greater role on the American scene.

Following the riots, the party decided to keep its campaign active. In an attempt to rally further student support, Archie Brown announced on May 20, 1960, that the party planned to emphasize "police brutality" to attract the sympathy of student groups. Brown was subsequently invited, along with other Communist leaders, to address youth groups and students at colleges in the San Francisco area. Further exploitation of youth in the area was anticipated by the party as it prepared to distribute 20,000 leaflets, captioned "From Blackmail to Blackjack," on college campuses.

In concluding his report, F.B.I. Director Hoover warned that the Communists in San Francisco proved just how powerful a weapon Communist infiltration is:

> They revealed how it is possible for only a few Communist agitators, using mob psychology, to turn peaceful demonstrations into riots.

Mr. Hoover concluded by emphasizing the importance which youth plays in the future of this country. Although the vast majority of American youth has demonstrated that it deserves "our confidence and support," the Communist conspiracy has also demonstrated that its efforts to infiltrate youth and student groups, labor unions, churches, professional groups, artists, newspapers, government, and the like, can "create chaos and shatter our internal security."

Mr. Hoover mentioned that today governments are toppling with "stunning rapidity" and warned:

> Whether large or small, the role Communists are playing in these events must not be discounted. The growing strength of our Nation over the years has not proven a deterrent to relentless efforts on the part of the Communist Party, USA, to destroy our security and prepare our Nation for a similar fate.
>
> Looking at the riots and chaos Communists have created in other countries, many Americans point to the strength of our Nation and say "It can't happen here." The Communist success in San Francisco in May 1960 proves that it can happen here.

THE COMMUNIST-LED RIOTS AGAINST THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

MAY 12–14, 1960

The Communist-led riots and demonstrations against the House Committee on Un-American Activities during its hearings in San Francisco, May 12–14, 1960, show an immediate need for realistic contempt of Congress powers for congressional committees. Details of the events which took place in San Francisco and committee-recommended legislation to cope with the problem were given by the committee in House Report 2228.[1]

At a meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities on April 5, 1960, a resolution to conduct hearings in San Francisco was unanimously adopted by all committee members present. The purpose of the proposed hearings was to develop information for legislative purposes on: (a) the extent, character, and objects of Communist infiltration and Communist Party activities in Northern California; (b) the past and present form, structure, organization, and activities of the Communist Party, and on members of the Communist Party, whether in California or elsewhere; (c) the entry into, and dissemination within, the United States of foreign Communist Party propaganda; (d) the techniques, strategies, tactics, and devices used by members of the Communist Party for the purpose of evading the impact of present security laws; and (e) any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which it, or any subcommittee thereof, appointed to conduct the hearings, may designate.

In a determined effort to obstruct and forestall the hearings, the Communist Party and its various fronts in the San Francisco area launched a major campaign, enlisting the support of demonstrators and non-Communist groups to protest the hearings. On the first day of the hearings, a Communist-led group succeeded in taking virtual control of the hearing room and, in one instance, forced suspension of the hearings for some 40 minutes. On the second day of the hearings, the party succeeded in agitating several hundred persons into violent action. Although valuable and much-needed information was developed during the hearings, the persistent disruptive tactics of the Com-

[1] See "The Communist-Led Riots Against The House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco, Calif., May 12–14, 1960," House Report No. 2228, October 7, 1960.

munists, their fellow travelers, and dupes gave clear evidence of the necessity for adoption of remedial legislative measures by the Congress.

The committee report warned that unless such measures are adopted, "the virus will spread and take hold and create such situations that lawful investigation * * * can be totally frustrated."

Inadequacy of present law is dealt with in the report. It is pointed out that as a result of present law, as indicated in the decision of *Anderson* v. *Dunn*, in which the Supreme Court decided that punishment for contempt before the bar of the Houses is limited to imprisonment during the session of the House affected by the contempt, contempts occurring or prosecuted late in a session must often escape just punishment. *United States* v. *Starkovich* points out that witnesses may be objectionable and vulgar and may vilify the committee as long as they answer questions or invoke rightfully claimed privilege. In this case, the court stated that "Misconduct of the witness at the hearing, however outrageous, however shocking it may be to the sense of propriety or whatever, is not a violation of (Section) 192 * * *" and hinted that congressional legislation could easily correct this situation.

The deficiency is only partially met in sections 192 and 194 of 2 USC, which provide for imprisonment for not less than one month nor more than twelve months, regardless of whether or not Congress is in session, but only in cases in which a witness refuses to appear or to testify or to produce papers.

The need for corrective legislation, the report noted, had previously been brought forth in the committee's "Annual Report for the Year 1956," in which a recommendation was made for "A method by which committee hearings may be protected against interference by misconduct of witnesses, counsel, and others."

The 1956 report recalled the outrageous conduct of Paul Robeson, a subpenaed witness in that year, whose contumacy compelled the committee to adjourn its hearings.

To cope with the misbehavior problem, the chairman of the committee introduced H.R. 2232 [1] on January 12 ,1959, which, if passed, would have alleviated the difficulties experienced in San Francisco. Following the San Francisco riots and demonstrations, the chairman introduced a separate bill, H.R. 12366, with provisions identical to section 302 of H.R. 2232, emphasizing the necessity of such a law in order to forestall obstructive tactics of witnesses and deliberately staged riots or other disorderly conduct employed and designed to frustrate proper inquiries.

Film footage of the San Francisco demonstrations and riots, taken on the scene by television stations KRON and KPIX, was prepared and composed into a documentary moving picture by Washington Video Productions, Inc. The film and its dialogue were incorporated as part of the report as graphic illustrations of the problem of misbehavior during congressional hearings. A brief synopsis of the film, entitled "Operation Abolition," follows.

---

[1] See section II of chapter VIII, "Legislative Recommendations," of this report, p. 123.

"OPERATION ABOLITION"

The film introduces several pamphlets, published by cited Communist-front organizations, which were distributed by Communist Party members during the San Francisco demonstrations and riots and, since that time, throughout the United States. These pamphlets call for the abolishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities and indulge in various smears against the committee.

Chairman Francis E. Walter, in opening the film, explained that "Operation Abolition" is the Communist Party's own name for its current concentrated drive to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to weaken the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to render sterile the security laws of our Government.

Communist agents shown and identified in the film include:

(1) Archie Brown, the second-in-command of the Communist Party in California who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Charles Blodgett, Dec. 3, 1953; by Barbara Hartle, May 12, 1960.

According to committee information Archie Brown is the second-ranking Communist in the Northern California District. His official party post is district committee member in charge of trade union matters.

Archie Brown appeared as a witness May 14, 1960. He refused to answer questions, insisting that he be permitted to read a prepared statement. Mr. Willis, chairman of the subcommittee conducting the hearings, ordered him escorted from the hearing room.

(2) Harry Renton Bridges, an international Communist agent and leader of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which was ousted from the CIO in 1950 as Communist-controlled.

According to sworn testimony of Agnes Bridges, former wife of Harry Bridges, the name of Harry Dorgan was inscribed on Bridges' Communist Party membership book. She testified to this effect before the Joint Legislative Fact-Finding Committee in the State of Washington.

Testimony to this effect was also given before the court during the Bridges, Robertson, Schmidt trial (see Brief for the United States submitted in the Supreme Court, October Term, 1952, No. 548, *Harry Renton Bridges, Henry Schmidt, and J. R. Robertson* v. *USA*, p. 12).

Appearing as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities on April 21, 1959, Bridges invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he had ever used the name of Harry Dorgan or been a member of the Communist Party.

(3) Ralph Izard, one of the top California Communist propagandists, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Charles Blodgett, Dec. 3, 1953.

According to committee information, Izard serves on the San Francisco County Committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. Izard appeared as a witness on May 14, 1960 and invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions regarding Communist Party membership and activities.

(4) Douglas Wachter, a Communist agent trained to specialize in youth activities.

According to committee information Mr. Wachter, the son of Saul Wachter, is a leader in Communist work among youth in the northern

California area and was a delegate to the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party in 1959.

He appeared as a witness on May 12, 1960, and invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions regarding Communist Party membership and attendance at the party convention.

(5) William Mandel, a Communist propagandist employed in the radio and television media who was identified as a Communist Party member by Louis Budenz, August 22, 1951, in testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommmittee.

The Daily Worker, July 27, 1958, reported that Mandel was "among the first of the rightwing deviationists to leave the ranks of the Communist Party after the February 1957 convention."

He appeared as a witness on May 13, 1960, and invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions pertaining to past or present Communist Party membership.

(6) Bertram Edises, one of the elite corps of Communist lawyers, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Charles Blodgett on Dec. 3, 1953; by Dr. Jack Patten on June 19, 1957.

He appeared as a witness on May 14, 1960, refused to answer questions regarding Communist Party membership and, because of contemptuous behavior, was escorted from the hearing room before stating his grounds for refusing to respond to committee questions.

(7) Frank Wilkinson, one of the top Communist agents assigned to the "Operation Abolition" campaign, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Anita Bell Schneider, December 7, 1956.

He appeared as a witness before the committee in July 1958 and refused to answer any questions asked by the committee. Mr. Wilkinson was cited for contempt.

(8) Merle Brodsky, a trained Communist agitator, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Moiselle J. Clinger on October 20, 1959.

Mr. Brodsky has held official positions in the party since the 1940's and, since that time, has been repeatedly identified in the Communist press as holding leadership positions in the party.

According to committee information, Mr. Brodsky is a member of the Northern California District Committee of the Communist Party and a party organizer in the East Bay region.

He appeared as a witness May 12, 1960, and invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions pertaining to Communist Party membership and activities.

(9) Saul Wachter, a trained Communist agitator, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by William Ames on Dec. 4, 1953.

According to committee information, he was a delegate to the National Convention of the Communist Party in 1959 and is active in the party's East Bay region Political Committee.

He appeared as a witness on May 14, 1960, and invoked the fifth amendment in response to questions pertaining to Communist Party membership and attendance at the conventon.

(10) Sally Attarian Sweet, a trained Communist agitator, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Charles Blodgett, Dec. 3, 1953.

According to committee information she is active in the Communist Party in the Hayward area (Alameda County).

She appeared as a witness May 13, 1960, and invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer pertinent questions.

(11) Morris Graham, a Communist agent, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Karl Prussion on May 13, 1960.

According to committee information, he is a member of the Communist Party's Northern California District Committee and a party organized in the Peninsula area, south of San Francisco.

He appeared as a witness May 13, 1960, invoked the fifth amendment, and refused to answer questions pertaining to Communist Party membership.

(12) Juanita Wheeler, a Communist agent, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Charles Blodgett, Dec. 3, 1953.

According to committee information, she is a member of the Northern California District Committee of the Communist Party and was a delegate to the party's National Convention in 1959.

(13) Vernon Bown, a professional Communist agitator, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Arthur Eugene, Jr., on Feb. 15, 1957.

In 1959 Bown was "unwillingly" ousted from his job as an organizer for an important party "section" in San Francisco and was finally expelled from the party itself. Documents written by Bown and a Communist associate on the details of this internal party conflict were made a part of the committee record at hearings held in San Francisco in May 1960.

At these same hearings, Bown appeared as a witness and invoked the fifth amendment in response to all questions relating to this party controversy, as well as to questions pertaining to his past and present Communist Party membership and activities.

Congressman Edwin E. Willis, chairman of the San Francisco subcommittee, explained in a press interview shown in the film that the committee was conducting hearings to develop information for legislative purposes.

In revealing the background of the demonstrations and riots, the film revealed the role that the Communists and Communist dupes played in inciting hostile action against the committee.

An article from the official University of California student newspaper, "The Daily Californian," called upon students to attend a rally against the committee and the committee's hearings and to "laugh out loud in the hearings when things get ridiculous."

Scenes depicting repeated disturbances in the hearing room led by identified Communist agents were included in the film. In the course of one such demonstration, the Communist agitators actually took control of the hearing room, and order was restored only after a specially trained police squad arrived on the scene and removed the agitators from the hearing room.

The film revealed that on the second day of the hearings, Friday, May 13, demonstrations inside the City Hall building reached their climax. Hundreds of students crowded outside the hearing room, attempting to force entrance to the proceedings and to compel the committee to abandon its efforts to develop information. The film showed the presence of a number of Communist agitators in leadership positions among the student demonstrators. As a result of the

chanting, clapping, singing, and cheering by the demonstrators in the hallways of the City Hall building, the judges in their chambers on the next floor were unable to continue court procedures, the film's narration pointed out. Orders were given to police officers to remove the demonstrators from City Hall. When efforts were made to carry out these orders, an open riot occurred, resulting in minor injuries to four students and the hospitalization of eight policemen. Among the Communists arrested during the riots, the narration pointed out, were Vernon Bown and Douglas Wachter.

Congressman Johansen, a member of the San Francisco subcommittee, warned in the film that the students who participated in the City Hall riots were "toying with treason":

> Among those arrested in the City Hall at San Francisco were a few trained Communist agents. The others were the unwitting dupes of the party who had, in the heat of chanting and singing, performed like puppets, with the Communists in control of the strings, even to the point of willfully and deliberately defying law and order.

The film revealed the three patterns of Communist disruption common in the "Operation Abolition" campaign:

(a) Demonstrations and defiance inside a congressional hearing room by witnesses and spectators;

(b) Open rioting and physical resistance to law enforcement both inside and outside hearing chambers;

(c) Propaganda declarations and defiance of the committee by individual witnesses and their attorneys.

This third type of Communist tactic was evidenced in the film by excerpts from the testimony of Douglas Wachter, Archie Brown, and William Mandel.

Congressman Scherer, in concluding the film, introduced an interview between a newsman and Frank Wilkinson, "one of the top Communist agents assigned to 'Operation Abolition.'" In the interview, Wilkinson admitted that his function as an official of the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms[1] was to travel to each community in the country where the Committee on Un-American Activities was to conduct hearings and to arouse resistance to the committee. In the interview Mr. Wilkinson was asked whether he was a Communist. He replied, "That's a very flattering remark," but refused subsequently to answer the newsman's question more specifically.

Congressman Scherer stated that the scenes portrayed in the film constituted only the surface manifestation of the extensive Communist operation to destroy the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Exhibits in the report include a pamphlet published and distributed by the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms urging abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Another exhibit contained the student directive from "The Daily Californian" urging students to create disturbances in the hearing room. The final exhibit is a picture taken in City Hall during the May 13 student riots.

---

[1] Cited as one of the major "front" organizations "created or completely controlled by the Communist Party" in the southern California area. (Annual Report, 1959, Committee on Un-American Activities, p. 78.)

WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Selective Chronology 1818–1957

VOLUME I

1818–1945

This volume, the first of a series, is a documented, chronological reference work covering the major developments in the birth and growth of world communism during the years 1818–1945.

The Chairman of the committee states in the foreword to the chronology:

> The growth of world communism from its beginning gives the appearance of an inverted pyramid. It is startling to consider that a movement of such dimensions and dynamism as communism is today had beginnings so meager and inconspicuous * * *. It is hoped that this chronology will give some perspective in depth to the reader and provide some basis for judging the continuity, tenacity, and all-encompassing character of the world Communist movement.
>
> That the Communist movement is a global movement with the Soviet Union as its leader is clearly and definitely demonstrated by this chronology. Other impressions come to light showing with equal force the characteristics of the movement: the unmitigating, unrelenting drive for world conquest; the resort to every stratagem of deceit, violence, and military aggression to achieve its ends; the dogmatic addiction to doctrine; its conspiratorial nature; the unquestioning obeisance of party members the world over to the ever-shifting political line laid down by Moscow; and, finally, the fanatical dedication of Communists to their cause, even to the point of accepting the most degrading personal humiliations for the sake of promoting its aims.

The first formal organization of an international Communist movement took place on September 28, 1864, when Karl Marx formed the First (Marxist) International, a "society of working men of all nations." This was succeeded by the Second (Socialist) International which was formed in 1889. At the 1907 Congress of the Second International, Lenin organized "a conference of the Lefts" to counterbalance the other factions in the group. In 1917 he used the Bolshevik branch of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party to overthrow the Kerensky government in Russia, and in March, 1919—five years after the collapse of the Second International—he founded the Third or Communist International, which he used to unite the various Communist parties of the world and establish Soviet Russian domination over them. The Kremlin has maintained control of the international Communist apparatus since that time.

The chronology demonstrates that the members of the American Communist Party have been among Soviet Russia's most dedicated

followers. In 1935, following Moscow's dictates, the CPUSA urged that America take a stand against Nazi Germany. For four years, the CPUSA, like Soviet Russia, beat its propaganda drums against Hitler. Then, on August 23, 1939, the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact was announced. This brought a reversal of the propaganda line of Moscow—and of the CPUSA. It was now "Keep America Out of the Imperialist War!" Two years later, the German invasion of Soviet Russia on June 22, 1941, forced the Soviet Union to reverse its line once more. The CPUSA followed suit. That very day, William Z. Foster, chairman of the American Communist Party, declared: "For full support and cooperation with the Soviet Union in its struggle against Hitlerism!" When Moscow demanded a "second front" early in World War II—long before it was even remotely feasible, the American Communists once again parroted its line.

The Communist leaders are masters of double talk which they call Aesopian language. Occasionally, however, they quite frankly spell out their true aims and some of their tactics. Lenin in his 1919 pamphlet, "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Renegade K. Kautsky," proclaimed that "The definite basis of dictatorship is suppression *by force* * * *." The chronology also points out that two years later, in 1921, Lenin said the Communists would seize power on a world scale.

Understandably there are limitations to any treatment of a subject as broad and vast as world communism. For this reason the chronology is not all encompassing. However, it is a valuable reference to developments in various Communist movements throughout the world. It records the strategies and activities of many Communist parties operating in free nations, their successes and failures, as well as their fluctuating membership figures. Also chronicled are important events in the Soviet Union and the resulting effect on the Communist parties in non-Communist countries which look for direction to the "leadership" party in control of the Soviet state.

The chronology notes, for example, that in 1919 Communist parties were formed in such widely separated countries as Mexico, Switzerland, and Indonesia. It shows that the American Communists claimed a membership of 9,000 members in 1929 and 100,000 just 10 years later. The chronology details the Communist take-over of the Veterans' Bonus March on Washington. It quotes authoritative sources on Communist organizations and institutions such as the Lenin University in Moscow where "* * * well-rounded training in the methods of fomenting revolution, gaining power, setting up a dictatorship, operating a government under a dictatorship, and handling the forces of oppression are taught."

Because communism is a world movement, the study has been placed within the context of international relations in order to make more meaningful the interrelationship of world events and communism.

The first volume covers events from 1818 to the end of 1945. Succeeding volumes in the series will trace the movement to the end of 1957.

The chronology and the index to it which will be published at the completion of the series, were prepared by Dr. Joseph G. Whelan, analyst in Soviet and East European Affairs, Foreign Affairs Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. Dr. Whelan's study was carried forth in consultation with Dr. Sergius Yakobson, senior specialist in Russian Affairs of the Library's Legislative Reference Service, and with the research staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

FACTS ON COMMUNISM, VOLUME II[1]

The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev

The committee during the year issued the second volume in its "Facts on Communism" series, aimed at providing a comprehensive survey of communism in both its theoretical and practical aspects.

Titled "The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev," Volume II traces the growth of the Communist (Bolshevik) movement in Tsarist Russia, graphically reconstructs its forceful seizure of government power in November 1917, and then critically reviews the programs and policies of the Communist regime within Russia over the last four decades.

Soviet Communist leaders, as well as scholars in the free world, are extensively quoted in the 367-page, heavily documented volume delineating "communism" in action in the nation which was the first to succumb to this form of totalitarian rule and which has consistently served as the directive base for organized international efforts to impose a similar system on all other nations.

In an era when the international Communist movement has singled out the United States as the main enemy in its all-out political, economic, and psychological warfare aimed at weakening free world resistance to Communist expansion, in an era when the present Soviet leader boldly declares to Americans that their grandchildren will live under Communist rule—it is vitally important for Americans to arm themselves with basic information on Communist doctrine, aims, and practices. Volume I of "Facts on Communism," issued by the committee in 1959, contributed to this essential understanding of communism by explaining and analyzing Communist ideology. The committee believes that Volume II makes an equally important contribution by its details on the actual operation of the Soviet Communist regime.

In its "Facts on Communism" series, the committee has sought the collaboration of scholars who are recognized for their specialized knowledge of certain phases of communism. Manuscript for Volume II was prepared by Dr. David J. Dallin, lecturer and author of numerous books on the Soviet Union. Dr. Dallin is a native of Russia and was an eye witness to the revolution which catapulted Communists to power in that country. Educated at the Universities of St. Petersburg, Berlin, and Heidelberg, he holds a doctorate in philosophy from the last-named institution. Dr. Dallin resided in Germany and France in the 1920's and 1930's and in 1940 emigrated to the United States,

[1] See "Facts on Communism," Vol. II, "The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev," Committee on Un-American Activities, December 1960. The supply of this publication for distribution by the committee is limited but copies may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., for $1.25 per copy.

where he resides as a U.S. citizen. He presently teaches a course in political science at the University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Dallin's published books include: *The Changing World of Soviet Russia; Soviet Espionage; Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy 1939–1942; Russia and Postwar Europe; The Big Three—The United States, Britain and Russia; The Real Soviet Russia; Soviet Russia and The Far East; The Rise of Russia in Asia*, and *The New Soviet Empire*. He is co-author with B. I. Nicolaevsky of *Forced Labor in Soviet Russia*, and his treatise, *Soviet Foreign Policy After Stalin*, will be published in January 1961.

Volume II of "Facts on Communism" is primarily devoted to a chronological account of policies applied by the ruling Communist clique in Russia from the time of its assumption of government power in 1917 up to the present day. The opening chapters, however, offer important historical background to the reader. The work refers back to the 19th century to show how Russian revolutionary tradition and Marxist ideas from Western Europe combined to shape the character of the first Russian Marxist party organized in 1898.

Lenin's character, philosophy, and activities are dwelt upon in detail beginning with this early period because, as the study states:

> There has never been in Russia, or perhaps anywhere else, a political party whose birth, growth, and maturity were so closely tied to the personal history of a single leader as in the case of the Bolshevik Party and its creator, Vladimir Lenin. * * * From the very start Lenin wielded almost unlimited power in his party. This was a phenomenon so unique and unprecedented that many observers have come to the conclusion that without Lenin there would have been no Communist regime in Russia.

Lenin's organization is also traced through the early years of the 20th century. In addition to a description of its fluctuating political strategies and the ebb and flow of adherents, the study shows how Lenin's organization centered upon a small band of strictly disciplined professional revolutionaries—comparable less to a political party than to an officers' corps in an army.

> Lenin's concepts of the role of the party in a sense forecast the party's assumption of dictatorial power after the revolution had been accomplished.

Following an account of the final coup by which the Bolshevik (Communist) minority overthrew a "defenseless" democratic government, Volume II of "Facts on Communism" describes the creation of a new one-party dictatorial Soviet government and its initial announcements promising a "grandiose program for the political and economic transformation of Russia." How the new government reneged on many of its promises and the tragic results of numerous others in their execution are revealed in subsequent chapters.

In the treatment of the immediate post-revolutionary period, there is extended discussion of Lenin's harsh offensive against the peasantry and of the police system set up to enforce the rule of a small minority, avowedly advocating the use of terror to accomplish its objectives.

The work records not only the plight of the peasant and the role of the police, but many other special aspects of the Soviet system in chronologically arranged chapters on: the civil war years of 1918–21; the period of the New Economic Policy, 1921–28; the years of Stalin's 5-year plans aimed at aggressive collectivization and industrialization, 1929–39; the Soviet-Nazi alliance; World War II; the postwar era and Stalin's death, 1945–53; the post-Stalin era, 1953–56; and the new and contemporary period in Soviet government policies discussed under the heading "Khrushchev in Power."

Among the other subjects given special attention are: the party hierarchy, which has always held a monopoly of power in the Soviet regime; the Red Army; treatment of national minorities in the Soviet Union; use of forced labor; and Soviet industrialization programs. In view of their decisive impact on the course of Soviet policy, considerable space is devoted to the views, character, and actions of all the Communist dictators—Lenin, Stalin, the "collective" leadership after Stalin's death, and finally Khrushchev. Their varying views on the world Communist revolution and so-called "peaceful coexistence" are discussed with particular emphasis on their domestic effects.

How Soviet leaders nullified or suppressed opposition within and without the party is also chronicled from 1917 to date. A separate chapter is reserved for discussion of the reign of terror conducted by Stalin against fellow members of the Communist hierarchy in Russia between 1934 and 1938. Among those who provided documentation for the thousands of arrests, trials, and executions of Communists along with non-Communists—with forced confessions often the sole proof of guilt—was Nikita S. Khrushchev himself.

Changes in Soviet policy after the death of Stalin in 1953 are discussed and analyzed in final chapters of Volume II of "Facts on Communism." By 1956, the study observes, the political climate in the Soviet Union had become "less oppressive, less terroristic" as the crimes of Stalin were publicized and the powers of the police substantially curtailed. Corollary developments included a government effort to satisfy some of the long-ignored consumer needs of the population and promises to reform the forced labor system and to rehabilitate oppressed national groups.

This trend toward "liberalization" in the immediate post-Stalin era—sometimes referred to as "The Thaw"—was brought to a halt in 1957, the work declares, when many Soviet leaders, institutions, and doctrines were threatened with loss of authority not only over Soviet citizens, but also among Communist disciples in other nations of the world.

Khrushchev, successful contender for Stalin's mantle, by late 1957 had established a "well-knit system of personal rule," "restored" some of Stalin's reputation, cracked the whip over Soviet artists and writers who had shown signs of rebellion against party controls, and fought disaffections from Moscow on the part of foreign Communist parties. The "aggressive" and "outspoken" new Soviet dictator not only reestablished the Soviet Communist Party in its dominant position among Communists abroad, but also inaugurated "a new period in the policies of the Soviet government."

The volume scrutinizes policies instituted by the Khrushchev regime and their implications, both for the Soviet Union and the free world.

Khrushchev's new agrarian program, coupled with a continuing emphasis on the build-up of heavy industry, economic competition with the United States, innovations in Communist ideology, and his efforts to intimidate the free world by brandishing Soviet missile and satellite accomplishments are all treated in this documented study.

The work concludes:

> More than four decades have passed since the seizure of power in Russia by the Bolshevik, the eventual Communist, party. In this space of time Russia has undergone a multitude of changes, lived through severely repressive eras as well as through periods of some relaxation, has seen a succession of leaders, awful wars as well as some progress. However, the basic elements of Leninism have been maintained to this day—a stern one-party rule, negation of political freedoms to the population, emphasis on military power, antagonism to democracy as a system and to the democracies as nations, and consequently—a permanent threat of a terrible conflict in the world. Soviet "Communism" has remained the greatest danger of our days.

CHAPTER IV

CONSULTATIONS

THE CRIMES OF KHRUSHCHEV

Part 5

Mr. JOSEPH PAUCO
Father THEODORIC JOSEPH ZUBEK
Mr. NUCI KOTTA
Mr. ARSHI PIPA

December 17, 1959

Eyewitness accounts of Khrushchev's barbaric subjugation of the people of the country formerly known as Slovakia, the current reign of terror being imposed on these people by Khrushchev's international Communist apparatus, and the inhumanities now being inflicted upon the people of Albania were detailed by four witnesses, Mr. Joseph Pauco, Mr. Nuci Kotta, Father Theodoric Joseph Zubek, and Mr. Arshi Pipa in a committee consultation on crimes committed by the Soviet premier.[1]

As World War II ended in the spring of 1945, Soviet and Czech troops under General Svoboda occupied Slovakia and established a so-alled "People's Democracy" which, according to Mr. Pauco, was simply a legal-sounding facade under which imprisonments, murders, and destruction could be continued.

In the first month of the new "government," Mr. Pauco recalled, two Slovak bishops and about 120 Catholic priests were ruthlessly incarcerated along with political opponents of communism.

---

[1] See "The Crimes of Khrushchev," Part 5, Consultations with Mr. Joseph Pauco, Father Theodoric Joseph Zubek, Mr. Nuci Kotta, and Mr. Arshi Pipa, Committee on Un-American Activities, December 17, 1959.

Mr. Joseph Pauco, born in Solvakia, worked until 1945 for several Slovak newspapers, after receiving a Ph. D. from the Slovak University in Bratislava. In April, 1945, he escaped to Austria and after 2 years moved to Munich, Germany. In April 1950 he emigrated to the United States. An assistant editor of a weekly Pennsylvania newspaper, Mr. Pauco also serves as secretary-general of the Slovak National Council Abroad. He is the author of several books on anti-Communist topics in Slovak and English.

Father Theodoric Joseph Zubek, born in Slovakia, was ordained a Franciscan priest in 1938. He was a teacher of theology in the Franciscan Seminary in Zilina, Slovakia, from 1941 to 1950. When the Communists suppressed all the monasteries in Slovakia, Father Zubek escaped to Austria in 1950, moved to Italy, and emigrated to the United States in 1952.

Mr. Nuci Kotta, born in Albania, left his native land in 1938 to study in Paris. He never returned there because of Fascist and Communist seizure of his native land. Since 1955, Mr. Kotta has been the deputy secretary-general of the Assembly of Captive European Nations in the United States.

Mr. Arshi Pipa, was born in Albania, obtained his doctorate in philosophy at the University of Florence. As a teacher and editor in Albania, Mr. Pipa was arrested by the Communists because of his anti-Communist sympathies. After spending 10 years in various prisons and slave labor camps in Albania, Mr. Pipa escaped to Yugoslavia and, in 1958, came to the United States as a permanent resident.

In spite of the fact that the Slovak nation voted against the Communist Party and elected the Democratic Party into power in May of 1946, the Democratic Party was forced to succumb to the Communists in 1948.

In describing the operations of the Soviet secret police in Slovakia, Mr. Pauco told how some 30,890 "hapless and innocent Slovaks" were exiled to the Soviet Union and to Siberian concentration camps in the spring of 1945.

Czech and Soviet secret police imprisoned almost 114,000 Slovaks in 1946 for so-called political crimes and have continued terrorizing Slovak citizens. Opponents of communism in Slovakia were, and still are, imprisoned at Leopoldov, which Mr. Pauco describes as "one of the severest and cruelest prisons and concentration camps."

Communist labor concentration camps in Slovakia are, according to Mr. Pauco, located at Novaky, Presov, and Muceniky, and many prisoners are sent to work in the uranium mines at Jachymov, in Sudetenland.

Mr. Pauco testified further that the Prague government is frantically building arms and missile industries in Slovakia and a great arsenal of atom bombs.

Father Theodoric Joseph Zubek gave detailed accounts of the Communist persecution of the Catholic church in Slovakia.

Father Zubek recalled how, on April 13, 1950, the Communists arrived at the Slovakian monasteries during the night, ordered the priests and brothers into trucks, and took them off to Svaty Benedik nad Hronom, one of the concentration monasteries. Here the Communists, through a process of brainwashing, attempted to "reeducate" the priests and brothers and "convert" them into pro-Communist priests. As a condition for reentry into public ministry, an oath of loyalty to the Communist regime was demanded.

The beginning of the persecution of Catholicism in Slovakia began with the institution of the so-called "People's Democracy" in 1945, according to Father Zubek. During that year, all Catholic schools were abolished, most Catholic periodicals were suppressed, church properties in excess of 35 acres were expropriated, and many priests and three Slovak bishops were imprisoned.

In an attempt to appease and use the Catholic church to serve its own ends, the Communist regime attempted on June 10, 1949, to establish and impose a Catholic, pro-Communist organization, "Catholic Action," as a dominating force in the church. The Holy See on June 20, 1949, issued a decree excommunicating all organizers, promoters, and members of this organization, but this did little to discourage the efforts of the Communists to impose the organization upon the Catholic population.

While the great bulk of the Catholic clergy remained loyal to their bishops and the Holy See, a few were persuaded by the Communists to join the "Catholic Action" side, Father Zubek said.

The Communists resorted to quasi-legal means to further their persecution of the "loyal" Catholics who resisted the Communist regime. On October 14, 1949, a series of antichurch laws were initiated, forcing all priests in public ministry to sign a pro-Communist loyalty oath and calling for the nationalization of all church properties. Those who resisted these orders were deposed from their posts, and most were imprisoned.

Male religious orders and congregations were suppressed in April 1950, Father Zubek testified:

> There were over 700 male religious priests and brothers living in 137 monasteries in Slovakia. They were taken forcibly to so-called concentration monasteries and were subjected to Communist-sponsored reeducation. If they complied with this brainwashing and took the oath of loyalty, they were sent to parishes and churches as diocesan priests. If they remained unyielding, they were sent to forced labor camps, and later, in 1957, released to manual work. * * * A similar fate met the female religious congregations. There were 3,548 religious sisters in Slovakia, living in 210 convents. The convents were suppressed in August 1950, and the sisters were forced to leave the religious life. If they refused, they were sent to work without any salary in forced labor camps, collective farms, or various state plants.

The Catholic Uniates were officially put out of existence on April 28, 1950, Father Zubek added.

Latest Communist efforts to persecute the church have had little effect, however, he explained, because of the fact that "the blood of martyrs," those already imprisoned and killed by the Communist purges, "is the seed of new Christians."

Mr. Nuci Kotta and Mr. Arshi Pipa gave testimony concerning the brutalities of the Communist conquest and Khrushchevian rule in Albania.

Mr. Kotta pointed out the strategic importance of Albania to the NATO forces in time of war, emphasizing the fact that the Soviet Union's control of the Bay of Valona, which has already been converted into a submarine base, would imperil allied navigation in the Mediterranean.

In explaining the history of the Communist takeover of Albania, Mr. Pipa pointed out that many patriotic Albanians were skillfully duped into cooperating with the Communists during the liberation in 1944. With the help of Yugoslav Communists, communism later came into power in Albania and still rules the land.

He added that the rule of Khrushchev in Albania has been much the same as that of Stalin, emphasizing that today an estimated 12,000 to 14,000 people still live in slavery in Albania.

The basic cause for the peasantry's hatred of communism is the forced collectivization of farmland which, according to Mr. Kotta, was started in earnest in 1955, when Khrushchev was firmly in power. At the time of his testimony, Mr. Kotta added, it was estimated that nearly 75 percent of all arable land in Albania had been collectivized, with the goal set at 100 percent.

Mr. Kotta testified that Albania today is basically a colony of the Soviet Union except that, because of resistance, the penal code is harsher than its Soviet model. He commented:

> Following that code, adopted in 1952, the age for penal responsibility for political crimes begins at 12. A boy or a girl, a child of 12 could be sent to prison for crimes against the state. Last December [1958] the age was changed to 14,

but I doubt whether in practice this would make much difference.

Conservative estimates place at 10,000 the number of people killed under the Communist government of Albania.

Accounts of how Khrushchev has exploited the industry of Albania were outlined by Mr. Kotta. Chromium ore, copper, and other minerals, as well as oil, are extracted in Albania and sold to the Soviet Union for prices which are far below the market price.

Under the Communist rule, Mr. Kotta pointed out, religion and religious freedom have been constant targets for Red persecution.

In concluding, Mr. Pipa offered the following description of communism based upon his own personal experiences and knowledge:

> In reality, communism means the system of prisons and slave labor camps. It means the repression of freedom of press, of freedom of gathering, of freedom of worship, and, in general, of what are called civil rights and human rights.

THE CRIMES OF KHRUSHCHEV

Part 6

MR. RUSI NASAR
MR. ERGACSH SCHERMATOGLU
MR. CONSTANT MIERLAK
DR. VITAUT TUMASH
MR. ANTON SHUKELOYTS

December 17, 1959

Accounts of the severe and brutal treatment of the people of the Baltic States, the Ukraine, and Byelorussia by Khrushchev's Communist government were given by five witnesses—Mr. Rusi Nasar, Mr. Ergacsh Schermatoglu, Mr. Constant Mierlak, Dr. Vitaut Tumash, and Mr. Anton Shukeloyts—in the committee's sixth consultation on "The Crimes of Khrushchev." [1]

Mr. Nasar and Mr. Schermatoglu described Khrushchev's brutal treatment of masses of humanity within the Soviet empire in effectuating his policies of forced deportation.

---

[1] See "The Crimes of Khrushchev," Part 6, Consultations with Mr. Rusi Nasar, Mr. Mr. Ergacsh Schermatoglu, Mr. Constant Mierlak, Dr. Vitaut Tumash, and Mr. Anton Shukeloyts, Committee on Un-American Activities, December 17, 1959.

Mr. Nasar, born in Turkistan, was drafted into the Soviet Army in 1940. After his capture by the Germans in 1941, he joined the Turkistan Legion and fought against the Soviets until May 1945. Following World War II, Mr. Nasar worked for the Voice of America as a free lance writer and later was employed as a lecturer at Columbia University. From June 1955 until July 1959 he was engaged in research work for the Linguistic Association in Washington, D.C., thereafter returning to free lance writing.

Mr. Schermatoglu, a native of Uzbekistan, was similarly drafted into the Soviet Army in 1941, and also captured by the Germans. After the war he remained in West Germany until his emigration to the United States in 1958, at which time he undertook research work concerning Turkistan.

Mr. Constant Mierlak was born in Byelorussia in 1919. He emigrated to Argentina following World War II, and in 1954 to the United States. Mr. Mierlak is the national president of the Byelorussian-American Association.

Dr. Vitaut Tumash was also born in Byelorussia. A medical doctor, he studied at the University of Vilna and in 1950 emigrated to the United States. Dr. Tumash is chairman of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in the United States.

Mr. Anton Shukeloyts, also a graduate of Vilna University, was arrested by the Communists in 1941, while teaching in Byelorussia. He worked as a custodian in the Museum of Minsk until 1944, when he was liberated by the Germans. He came to the United States as a refugee in 1950.

Mr. Schermatoglu pointed out that, after Khrushchev's policy of colonization began in 1953 and 1954, approximately a million and a half people were deported to Turkistan from the European part of the Soviet Union.

While Khrushchev was in power in the Ukraine (1938 to 1949), Mr. Nasar added, he was responsible for deporting nearly one million people to Turkistan from that area. In so doing, he explained, Khrushchev was able to accomplish two prime goals: first, to rid the Ukraine of resistors to the Communist government and, second, to arouse some antagonism between the settling Ukrainians and the native Turkistans. Khrushchev did this under the cover of a policy for developing the virgin lands, the witness said.

Mr. Schermatoglu presented statistics proving that brutality inflicted under the Khrushchev regime exceeded that of Stalin's. When Stalin controlled deportation policies in Turkistan, 174 State-controlled forced labor camps were developed "in which the workers were, in effect, slaves for the State." This number has increased to almost 900 since Khrushchev seized power. He pointed out that all of the forced deportations and forced resettlements were carried out at the threat of death to the emigrants and under careful and strict supervision of the Soviet military forces and secret police.

He testified that, although the exact number of concentration camps in the Soviet Union is a State secret, every agricultural enterprise has forced labor brigades. In addition, hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children have been placed forcibly in slave labor groups which move from area to area performing various tasks.

Mr. Schermatoglu stated:

> Khrushchev and his bloody regime may dispute the existence of slave labor camps because they are not called slave labor camps, but for all intents and purposes they have every element of a slave labor camp, including starvation, brutalities, the infliction of death upon those who do not conform to the rigid discipline, the deprivation of human liberty, and all of the other elements which were present in the slave labor camps as they were formerly characterized in the regime of Stalin.

Mr. Constant Mierlak gave details concerning the Khrushchev program for annihilation of Byelorussia (White Russia).

He testified that Khrushchev has adopted a Stalinist plan of eventual annihilation of Byelorussian nationality, complete with terror, physical destruction, mass shootings, and deportations to concentration camps, although he has used different methods to apply it.

Through a series of population shifts, he pointed out, Khrushchev has managed to denationalize Byelorussia and other regions within the Soviet empire. Following the depopulation and denationalization process, Mr. Khrushchev has carried out a program of Russification.

Dr. Vitaut Tumash testified that, under the Khrushchev regime, the annual rate of deportations of Byelorussians to distant lands is higher than it was during the years of Stalin's rule. He added that, under Khrushchev, deportations of hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children is a permanent activity.

Comparing the Khrushchev method with that of Stalin's, Dr. Tumash stated:

> There are some differences, but really there is no change in principles, no change in goals. One of the differences, to take an example, was that when Stalin had these mass deportations performed from Byelorussia, his aim was mostly to destroy these people physically He arrested them and sent them to concentration camps, where they had to endure and work under inhuman conditions, and perish. It seems that Khrushchev's method is, on the other hand, that he does not think about killing the population, but he wants to transfer it to other regions, to Russify it and to use it for colonization of other Republics of the U.S.S.R. His intent does not seem to be to destroy them physically, but nationally, and through this action to make Russians stronger in numbers on the one hand, and on the other to decrease the population of the non-Russian Republics, in this case, the Byelorussian population.

Mr. Anton Shukeloyts testified on the destruction of religion under the Communist regime. He stated that although Byelorussia had been a Christian nation for almost a thousand years, Communist anti-religious terror has resulted in the fact that not one Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish church or synagogue existed in the territory of Byelorussia, S.S.R., by the beginning of World War II.

He cited specific instances in which churches and synagogues, subsequently reopened during the German occupation, had been converted into museums, garages, warehouses, sports clubs, and theatres under Khrushchev's reign.

> Basically, the religious life of the Byelorussian people under Khrushchev dictatorship differs very little from the life under Stalin's terror. Religions and churches of all denominations in Byelorussia are still under continuous oppression and persecution. The final Khrushchev goal is the total destruction of every faith.

THE CRIMES OF KHRUSHCHEV

Part 7

MR. GUIVY ZALDASTANI — MR. GEORGE NAKASHIDSE
MR. DIMITAR K. PETKOFF — MRS. CATHERINE BOYAN CHOUKANOFF

January 8, 1960

The sufferings of the people of Georgia and Bulgaria under the bloody suppression of Khrushchev's terroristic rule are recounted in Part 7 of "The Crimes of Khrushchev," a consultation with Mr. Guivy

Zaldastani, Mr. George Nakashidse, Mr. Dimitar K. Petkoff, and Mrs. Catherine Boyan Choukanoff.[1]

Mr. Zaldastani detailed current conditions in Georgia under the reign of Nikita S. Khrushchev. He described how a group of students peaceably assembled in the capital of Georgia in March of 1956 to call for their individual liberties and the dismissal of Khrushchev.

Immediately, Mr. Zaldastani said, Russian troops were called to the city, together with tanks, to punish the students. The Reds surrounded the city and cut off all means of escape. The demonstrators, flanked on one side by closed buildings and surrounded by troops and tanks, had only one alternative to capture by the Communists—a leap over rocky cliffs into the currents of the River Kura. Rather than live under Soviet tyranny, some 600 of the demonstrators died in attempting to escape by plunging into the river.

Mr. Zaldastani added that those who had assisted the demonstrators were killed or punished severely and cited the example of two boys and a girl who had set up a transmitter and radioed word of the rebellion to the free world. Russian troops bayoneted the trio and threw their bodies into the streets.

Whereas a civilized government would have understood and very likely would have accepted discussion of rights issues, according to Mr. Zaldastani, "For Khrushchev, the only answer * * * was death to those who challenged his authority."

Religion in Georgia has been suppressed so thoroughly by Khrushchev, he added, that it is a challenge to the regime for a person to attend services, and ministers are no longer allowed to preach sermons.

In response to recent contentions in the Soviet press that slave labor camps no longer exist in the Soviet Union, Mr. Zaldastani explained—

> the slave labor camps, which have existed in the Soviet Union since its conception, still exist, but under different names. They are being called now "correction camps," "labor camps," et cetera.

Mr. George Nakashidse recalled how Khrushchev, in 1937–38, had been personally responsible for the execution and banishment to Siberia of hundreds of thousands of Georgian workers, educators, clergy, and others.

---

[1] See "The Crimes of Khrushchev," Part 7, Consultations with Mr. Guivy Zaldastani, Mr. George Nakashidse, Mr. Dimitar K. Petkoff, and Mrs. Catherine Boyan Choukanoff, Committee on Un-American Activities, January 8, 1960.

Mr. Guivy Zaldastani, born in Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia, was forced to leave his native land in 1925 for Paris, France, after his father escaped to that city. His father had been a leader of the unsuccessful national insurrection against Soviet rule in 1924. Mr. Zaldastani is the vice president of the Georgian National Alliance in the United States.

Mr. George Nakashidse was arrested by the Bolshevik government while attending the Georgian State University in Tiflis, Georgia, in 1922. After serving an 11 months' prison term, he was exiled and took up residence in Germany. He arrived in the United States in 1959.

Mr. Dimitar K. Petkoff, born in London, England, was attached to the Bulgarian Embassy in Bucharest, Rumania in 1945. He escaped from Bulgaria in 1948, spent time in a Communist jail in Yugoslavia, emigrated to Italy and came to the United States in 1954. A member of the executive committee of the Bulgarian National Committee, Mr. Petkoff is also a vice chairman of the legal committee of the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Mrs. Catherine Boyan Choukanoff was born and educated in Bulgaria. As a reporter for the Ministry of Information in Bulgaria, Mrs. Choukanoff was present at the so-called people's trials in her country after the Communist takeover in September, 1944. She left Bulgaria in 1946, and arrived in the United States in March of that year. She is currently employed as a map drafter.

Since 1939, as a member of the Politburo, Khrushchev has maintained his bloodthirsty operations, Mr. Nakashidse pointed out. This is revealed in Khrushchev's actions in 1956 at the time of the Hungarian uprising when, in the face of a strong national movement for independence, Khrushchev professed a virtual surrender to Hungary's demand—and then brutally slaughtered the freedom fighters as peace negotiations were in progress.

Mr. Nakashidse further related details of the exploitation by the Communists of Soviet Georgia, the destruction of its cultural life, and the deprivation by Khrushchev's terror mechanism of all basic freedoms. The Red regime maintains itself in power "by terror, by force, by intrigue, under the bayonets of Moscow," he concluded.

Mr. Dimitar K. Petkoff gave a vivid description of the Communist exploitation of Bulgaria. Bulgarian youths, he pointed out, have been deported to the Soviet Union as "volunteers" although given no opportunity to refuse to go. Those who attempted to resist the deportation, he added, were branded as traitors and told that they must go. As of July 30, 1957, some 10,000 young Bulgarians had been sent off to Kazakhstan and Siberia. Mr. Petkoff asserted: "From that time those deportations have continued, so they are much more."

Mr. Petkoff stated that the entire elected body of the National Assembly (Parliament) was arrested following the elections of 1947. Some of the leaders were killed, some exiled:

> The elected representatives of the people were imprisoned and many are still in prison under this regime of Khrushchev's, with his smile of humanitarianism.

Mr. Petkoff named seven members of the National Assembly who had been murdered or had died in prison in this purge, and seven more who are still under Communist arrest.

Mrs. Catherine Boyan Choukanoff read letters which had been written by Bulgarian people living in what they described as "the Red Hell." In these letters the Bulgarians appealed for food and medicine to fight rampant starvation and disease and to warn those of the outside world to "Guard your freedom."

Mrs. Choukanoff pointed out that, although there is very probably an abundant supply of consumer goods in Bulgaria, such items are far out of the financial reach of all except members of the "so-called new class," a few privileged collaborators, the diplomatic corps, and visiting friends of the Red regime.

Under Khrushchev, she concluded, the Communist hold on Bulgaria is tightening:

> Having succeeded in transplanting Soviet police methods on Bulgarian soil, in merging the nation's economy with that of the U.S.S.R. and in abandoning even the pretense to a foreign policy of its own, the same regime has been trying as hard to stifle any intellectual independence and to regiment all artistic and creative efforts. It is here, however, in what might be called the spiritual sector, that it has encountered some of its most serious frustrations.

LEST WE FORGET!

A Pictorial Summary of Communism in Action

MR. KLAUS SAMULI GUNNAR ROMPPANEN

January 13, 1960

A detailed pictorial account of the atrocities and bloody history of Communist conquest was submitted and explained to the committee in 1960 by Klaus Samuli Gunnar Romppanen.[1]

Mr. Romppanen submitted photographs showing various atrocities, propaganda techniques, torture devices, and destruction of human life and property resulting from Communist operations in Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, East Berlin, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Ukraine, and the Soviet Union.

Among photographs showing the Communist method of dealing with those who had committed a "political offense" was a photograph of a child who had been left to starve to death after being released from a Soviet prison camp after his parents had been incarcerated by the Communists.

Another exhibit portrayed a gag "used by the secret police on their victims." According to Mr. Romppanen:

> At Pirita-Kose, a village area of about 4 or 5 miles from the Estonian capital, Tallinn, in houses of the League of Estonian Journalists and of Banker Klaus Scheel, a Soviet military tribunal (Chairman Sergei Kingissepp), sentenced anti-Communists to death and executed them, burying corpses under the floors of those houses. In August 1941, after the Soviet troops were driven out of Estonia, the mass graves were opened. In one grave 15 persons, 14 male and 1 female, were found who had been buried alive in sandy earth outside the house. According to an autopsy by Dr. Med. Lindeberg, sand was found in the windpipes and lungs of victims but no other cause of death. In the mouths of all corpses were found gags, made of cotton cloth, filling the mouth tightly, so that the arrested person could not call for help.

Other photographs depicted Communist mass deportations of political offenders to slave labor camps in the Soviet Union in railroad cars, Catholic priests and other clergymen who had been tortured to death by the Communists, the mass destruction of an innocent population by Soviet guns, and numerous other atrocities.

---

[1] See "Lest We Forget! A Pictorial Summary of Communism in Action," Consultation with Mr. Klaus Samuli Gunnar Romppanen, January 13, 1960.

Mr. Romppanen, born in Finland and the former chief inspector of that country's Weapons Division, Ordnance Section, supervising about 70 munitions factories, was active in his native country in anti-Communist underground work prior to com[illegible] to the United States. During this period he was in a position to gather photograp[illegible]munism in action.

Mr. Romppanen came to the United States in 1949 and, since that t[illegible] his anti-Communist efforts as president of "The Fight For Freedom—A

In describing the origin of the photographs, Mr. Romppanen explained:

> They [the Communists] can conceal from the free world only part of their crimes; so enormous, so extensive have been the massacres and the brutalities, that notwithstanding attempts to shroud them in secrecy, heroic people risking their lives with a hope that somehow, someway, the free world can know the truth, have taken these and other photographs.

In concluding, Mr. Romppanen expressed his hope that "the leaders of this great country which is the hope of the world, will understand the nature of the enemy we face."

Mr. Romppanen further pointed out:

> The people whose photographs I have revealed in these exhibits, if they could speak from their graves, would utter a warning: "You who are yet free must behold the awful truth; there is no compromise possible with communism; unless it is overcome and vanquished it will destroy you, too."

SOVIET "JUSTICE"

"Showplace" Prisons vs. Real Slave Labor Camps

MR. ADAM JOSEPH GALINSKI

April 4, 1960

Most of the millions of people in Soviet slave labor camps are completely hostile to the Soviet Government, hate Khrushchev as they did Stalin, rejoice at any setbacks Moscow suffers, and look forward to the downfall of communism in the Soviet Union, Adam Joseph Galinski declared in testimony before the House Committee On Un-American Activities on April 4, 1960.[1]

Mr. Galinski used the following words to describe the feeling of the great majority of slave-labor-camp inmates in the Soviet Union toward the United States:

> America is a legend with them. They consider it a country which is almost beyond anything that can be hoped for on this earth. They understand that it is truly a free country. For instance, all of the Soviet soldiers who had been in contact with American troops during the war were always

[1] See "Soviet 'Justice'—'Showplace' Prisons vs. Real Slave Labor Camps," Consultation with Mr. Adam Joseph Galinski, Committee on Un-American Activities, April 4, 1960.
Mr. Galinski, who spent 12 years in seven different slave labor camps in the U.S.S.R. and participated in the uprising which took place in the Vorkuta slave labor camps in July 1953, is a lawyer and a former official of the social security branch of the pre-World War II Polish Government. Galinski fought in both the anti-Nazi and anti-Communist underground in the Vilna area. Captured by the Nazis and sent to a concentration camp in Lithuania, he managed to escape just before he was to be executed. He made his way back to Vilna and again became a leader of the underground in that area, this time directing activities against the Soviet occupiers of Poland. Because of his activities, his wife was seized by the MVD and sent to a Siberian slave labor camp. On July 14, 1945, the anniversary of his escape from the German concentration camp, he, too, was arrested by the MVD. Although a Pole, Galinski was convicted as a traitor to the Soviet Union. After a so-called trial, he was sentenced to death. His sentence was subsequently changed to 15 years at hard labor, confiscation of his property, loss of civil rights for 5 years, and permanent settlement in the Vorkuta area of Siberia after the completion of his sentence.

asked to tell tales about it. Up to a certain point they might even exaggerate in their opinion about American military might. They believe that America is invincible, and they believe that in the end communism will be overthrown by American efforts.

They did not believe the Soviet propaganda which charged American troops in Korea with atrocities against prisoners of war. They realized that this was a lie, the purpose of which was to prevent mass surrenders on the part of Soviet troops in case of war. If there were war, they all believed that Soviet soldiers would surrender to the Americans at every opportunity.

As far as their feelings toward communism and the Soviet Union are concerned, Mr. Galinski stated:

> Their feelings toward the government were completely hostile. They were of the opinion that Russia is in the hands of a clique which maintains itself by terror and which has nothing in common with the people. They rejoice in any defeat or any setback of Soviet diplomacy. For instance, in 1956, at the time of Budapest and at the time of the October change of government in Poland, they all expressed happiness, saying that the Hungarians and the Poles were brave people who did not give in to the Communists.

Mr. Galinski was asked what he thought of some of the reports on conditions of Soviet prisons and "correction colonies" which have been brought back to the United States by some well-known American visitors. He stated that it was not until after he had gotten out of the Soviet Union at the end of 1956 that he ever heard of anyone being permitted to visit a real prison or slave labor camp. Reports of such visits, he said, were—

> a tale out of "A Thousand and One Nights." Not only were there no such visits at any time when I was there, but the entire area of Vorkuta was a closed area where no one could penetrate. It was entirely guarded by the MVD. Not only were there no visits from non-Communists, but there were no visits from Communists, either.

Mr. Galinski said that just before his release in December 1956, he was moved from Vorkuta to a camp at Uglich, about 120 miles from Moscow. There he found conditions of filth and vermin, such as had existed in Vorkuta many years earlier. When he was asked how, in view of this fact, American visitors could report that they had seen camps that were immaculately clean, with happy, well-fed prisoners, etc., Mr. Galinski said that he had heard from Russian prisoners that there were—

> camps which were simply sham and which were made for tourists to see. The inmates of those camps are not prisoners, but MVD soldiers who are disguised as prisoners and coached in the types of answers which they are to give to foreign visitors.

He branded as false, reports brought back to this country that the MVD Special Board had been shorn of all power in 1953. The MVD, he said, was still in complete control of Soviet slave labor camps and prisoners at the time of his release in December 1956.

Soviet justice, Mr. Galinski said, was a farce. The MVD makes arrests on its own with no authorization from higher authority. In his own case, he said, the order for his arrest was dated 5 days after he was actually seized by the MVD. He, like most people accused of crime within the Soviet empire, was not permitted to have a defense attorney. The fate of prisoners prior to their trial is in the hands of the MVD investigators, who use various methods of torture to force prisoners to confess and to inform on others. Many prisoners die under this treatment. When the prisoner finally writes his confession, he is made to sign it in such a way that a blank space is left between his signature and the last words he wrote. This permits the investigators to add above his signature anything they care to as part of his confession.

In his own case, a noncommissioned officer of the guard told him before his trial started just what his sentence would be. He could do this because it had been decided in advance by Moscow. The trials, he told Galinski, were "a pure mockery."

Appeal is permitted and, in many cases in which the death sentence is meted out, the court will make an appeal for commutation even if the prisoner does not. The sentence is then changed to 15 or 20 years of hard labor in the slave camps of Siberia. The purpose of this, Mr. Galinski said, is to obtain large working forces for the coal and gold mines of that area.

Mr. Galinski described conditions in the Vorkuta slave labor camps, in which he was imprisoned, as "horrible." He also stated that there was inadequate medical care and that the food was of such incredibly poor quality that scurvy was rampant. Maladministration, poor sanitation facilities, and vermin and filth of all kinds, resulted in enormous death rates. Of the weather in the Vorkuta area, he said:

> The average temperature in winter, which is 8 months of the year, was about 40° or 42° below zero, but it went as far down as 75° below occasionally. In the summer, it would go up to 30° on a few isolated days. Most of the time, however, it was cold even in the summertime, and rainy.

Criminal gangs were powerful in the camps and, on top of the conditions of cold, filth, and torture, made the life of the inmates almost unbearable. These gangs, Mr. Galinski said, were set up by groups—thieves, grafters, and so on. They were extremely well organized, and groups of 50 to 60 such prisoners could terrorize a camp containing 5,000 to 6,000 men. Murder was one of their most effective weapons. The bosses of the criminal gangs lived better than anyone else in the camps, including the guards. They never did any work and ate and drank as they pleased. Even the guards feared them and could not control them.

Mr. Galinski said that conditions improved somewhat in the slave labor camps of Vorkuta during the years 1954–56. When asked if he

believed that this condition would continue for any length of time, he replied that—

> having lived in the Soviet Union, I can say that the regime of the Soviet Union will never be able to do without police terror. This is because, in the first place, there is a silent but constant opposition on the part of the people that has to be kept down. Second, the Soviet society is rotten through and through with graft, with thievery, and, therefore, there will always be a need for jails, for camps, for common criminals to be imprisoned.

As far as the Russian people themselves are concerned, Mr. Galinski declared:

> They will breathe freely only when they are free from the Communist yoke. No matter how the so-called liberal trends of the Khrushchev regime seem, I do not believe that these people can be happy or free as long as there exists a Communist Party.

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC WARFARE

Dr. Robert Loring Allen

April 6, 1960

Communist-bloc trade may be playing "the most important role" in the Communists' drive for world domination, Dr. Robert Loring Allen informed the committee during a consultation on April 6.[1]

Dr. Allen, a professor of economics specializing in the field of international trade, stated that Communist goals can be advanced by military, ideological, political, psychological, and economic methods. However, because the destructive nature of modern weapons makes military action a "very risky proposition" and Western concepts of freedom are so fundamentally hostile to Communist ideology, the expert expressed the convicton that—

> the Soviet Union may well be increasingly looking to trade as a way to carry influence where ideology cannot work, where military action is inadvisable, and where direct political pressure—where the possibility for direct political pressure—is not feasible as a weapon of conquest.

The whole world, he said, remains "extremely susceptible" to economic and psychological warfare, and both elements are combined in Soviet efforts to make trade and foreign assistance a means of influence or control over non-Communist nations.

---

[1] See "Communist Economic Warfare," Consultation with Dr. Robert Loring Allen, Committee on Un-American Activities, April 6, 1960.
Presently an associate professor of economics at the University of Oregon, Dr. Allen has had five years' service as an intelligence officer for the United States Government, assigned to economic research on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. He was also associate professor of economics at the University of Virginia, where he for three years directed a research project on the foreign economic activities of the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and Red China.

In support of his conclusions, Dr. Allen analyzed Communist-bloc trade and aid programs on both a world-wide and individual nation basis.

He presented statistics showing that Communist-bloc exports and imports with free nations totaled no more than 3 percent of free world trade as of 1958. He warned, however, that such figures fail to show that "the significance of a million dollars' worth of Soviet trade is far beyond the significance of a million dollars of French trade or American trade" because it is undertaken for a specific economic or political purpose.

Whereas private traders are interested in profit, Communist trade negotiators serve a government which automatically considers the political, strategic, psychological, and ideological advantages of trade agreements, and the negotiators also have superior bargaining power over private traders as a result of their backing by the entire power of a government, he explained. The Soviet Union, he added, makes trade "more important than it is," not only by "carefully selecting trading partners," but also by the use of propaganda and Communist parties in the non-Communist nations concerned.

Communist-bloc trade is also expanding at a more rapid rate than free-world trade, Dr. Allen advised the committee, and the expansion is most rapid in the non-industrialized countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. If the present trend continues, he declared, Communist nations could become the leading trading partner in every country in Asia, Africa, and Latin America within the next 15 to 20 years.

In the underdeveloped countries, Communist nations have also been operating a program of foreign economic and military assistance, inaugurated in 1955, because "they felt that the United States was gaining very significant political advantages in the cold war as a result of its aid program," the consultant pointed out. He estimated that approximately $3 billion in aid had been pledged by the Communist nations in Europe and Asia to underdeveloped countries, principally Egypt, Afghanistan, Indonesia, India, Iraq, Yugoslavia, and Argentina. Regarding the application of this aid program, Dr. Allen said—

> while there are many protestations of "no strings attached," a country which does not retain the political friendship of the Soviet Union is frequently abruptly told that its economic assistance has been terminated.

The way in which the Soviet Union has employed trading agreements as instruments to influence and control non-Communist nations was demonstrated by Dr. Allen's references to the actual situation in a number of countries.

The bulk of Communist trade is presently with Western European countries and primarily for reasons of economic need, Dr. Allen stated. He dwelt in detail on the economic arrangements between the Soviet Union and Finland, however, to demonstrate his thesis that the nation, while still managing to keep Communists out of its government, is in fact "an economic satellite" which "cannot afford not to get along with the Soviet Union." He also discussed Iceland where, he said—

> the Soviet Union very clearly is using its trade to attempt to influence Iceland to withdraw from NATO, which would

mean the elimination of the airbase at Reykjavik, as well as the introduction of much more elaborate economic planning within the Icelandic economy.

The present volume of Communist trade with Egypt cannot be justified on strictly economic grounds, Dr. Allen said, and the Communists' political and strategic motive in that trade is a reduction of Egypt's freedom of action in international affairs.

The Soviet Union or other Communist nations have in every instance taken the initiative in entering into trade relationships with non-Communist countries, he noted. In the case of the newly independent Ghana, for example, a Soviet trade delegation arrived to negotiate an agreement "before the paint was dry" on the signs on the new Soviet diplomatic offices.

Dr. Allen said such trade delegations provide an opportunity for the Soviet Union to acquire industrial and commercial information about trading partners which is "of immense intelligence value," although not in the "cloak and dagger" sense. In addition, he cited proven instances in which the delegations have served as official cover for Communist espionage agents. He also demonstrated avenues for Communist sabotage which had opened up as a result of the Czech Communist government's efforts to obtain a contract to rework the communications system of a Latin American city.

In the technical aspects of trade with the free world, Dr. Allen stated, the Soviet Union buys and sells at world market prices; pays in most cases in dollars, sterling, or marks with no mention of rubles; and acts "fairly decently in its trade * * * to try to keep their trading partners moderately satisfied, within the limits of what they can afford politically." Dr. Allen said that, although he does not have the most recent statistics, he does not believe the Soviet Union is in the gold market for speculative purposes thus far and that they are not gold buyers:

> If we followed the notion of what the Soviet Union is trying to do at the moment, which is to acquire increasing power over other countries, it would appear that the way they can do this best is by a sort of gradual encroachment into world markets. If they start acting like a bull in a china shop, by throwing gold around hither and yon and disrupting markets, this would be counterproductive.

Dr. Allen expressed the opinion that trade is an important instrument of Kremlin leaders who have abandoned the idea that "somehow or other the world would be magically transformed into a world in which everyone accepted a Communist faith." He saw the Soviet purpose as the achievement of increasing political, economic, and military power "to the point where they are not, and cannot be, challenged by any other power in the world":

> It is not at all necessary that countries go Communist or are taken over by a Communist Party so long as the fundamental elements of sovereignty are transferred from that country to the Soviet Union * * *.
>
> The ultimate objective is the maintenance of a Communist elite, using whatever resources—political, economic and military—that are available throughout the rest of the world,

which they hope will be under their control for their own benefit. At the moment this benefit resides in a small portion of the Russian people.

In the case of nations already under Communist rule, however, Dr. Allen pointed out that the Soviet Union has used trade and other commercial relationships to insure their subservience to the Soviet Union. The economies of the Eastern European satellites, he noted, are "enmeshed" in the Soviet economy as a result of a series of measures undertaken in recent years. Because Yugoslavia continued to stray from the ideological line of the Soviet Union, retaliations included the halting of all Soviet economic assistance to the country in May of 1958 and a precipitous drop in trade between Yugoslavia and other Communist nations.

In order to minimize the effects of Communist economic warfare against the free world, Dr. Allen recommended improvements in, and more effective use of, the private trading system. He declared:

I think that we ought to arrange our own affairs in such a way that trade with the Communist bloc by other countries is not particularly advantageous. We ought to provide such a healthy, sound, international economy, or contribute to a sound, healthy, international economy, that the Kremlin cannot make any headway with its gimmicks and gadgets and with its offers of premium prices and things of that sort. What we want are free international markets. Then when the Soviet Union does business, they have to behave just like any other country. There is no advantage in side deals with really free international markets and relatively free flow of goods and services.

This does not mean that there will not be any trade barriers. Countries will always have trade barriers. I think in some cases trade barriers are to excess. And we ought not to divide up the world amongst ourselves. We ought not to adopt the techniques of the opposition. We ought to give every advantage, every possible advantage, to the development of the private trading system, free enterprise system, in trade.

HOW THE CHINESE REDS HOODWINK VISITING FOREIGNERS

MR. ROBERT LOH

April 21, 1960

Accounts of how the Chinese Communists spend huge sums of money, organize and train thousands of their enslaved subjects, and create lavish showcases to hoodwink visiting foreigners were given in testimony by Robert Loh, who escaped from Red China in the summer of 1957.[1]

[1] See "How The Chinese Reds Hoodwink Visiting Foreigners," Consultation with Mr. Robert Loh, Committee on Un-American Activities, April 21, 1960.

Mr. Loh, born in Shanghai, obtained his M.A. degree at the University of Wisconsin, and returned in 1949 to China to accept an associate professorship at the University of Shanghai. Thoroughly disillusioned with the regime after teaching for 2 years, he became a mill manager and acted as a "showcase" capitalist and receptionist-host for visiting foreigners in Shanghai while waiting for the opportunity to escape.

Mr. Loh described in detail many of the methods employed by the Red Chinese to hide the truth about communism in action from foreigners. He testified that about a dozen cities were designated as "showcases" for foreign visitors who, on their "tours" of Red China, were allowed to visit only these cities.

Special committees were formed in each of these cities to play host to the guests. Extensive Communist investigations into the background of every foreign visitor long before his arrival provided the committees with details concerning his tastes and hobbies, Mr. Loh revealed. "They also know generally the kind of questions the tourists are going to ask," he added.

Superiors would advise the individual receptionist-hosts on a day-to-day basis of the itinerary for each visitor, and the receptionist-host would report his activities to his superior at day's end.

Citing the September 1956 visit of President Sukarno of Indonesia to Red China as an example of Chinese Communist hoodwinking techniques, Mr. Loh disclosed that preparations for his reception began about a month in advance of his arrival.

Communist officials addressed meetings of students and workers in Shanghai, emphasizing the importance of the arrival of the "anti-colonialist" Sukarno. Mr. Loh added that the theme stressed at these meetings was the need to favorably impress President Sukarno and thus enlist his support in the "fight against American imperialism."

Intricate instructions on how to dress and behave were given at these meetings, and the Communists told the people that it was an honor to be selected to act as the "masses" for Sukarno's reception.

Mr. Loh estimated that a half million Chinese attended these meetings and that, as the date of the Indonesian President's arrival approached, these "masses" were coached and rehearsed with greater intensity. He added that when President Sukarno arrived, the reception operated like clockwork and that the crowds, as previously drilled, had greeted him with cries of "Bung (Brother) Karno."

Mr. Loh stated that the Red Chinese have special hotels in which foreign visitors are accommodated and that the personnel of the hotels undergo a training period of 4 to 6 months in techniques of handling foreign visitors.

The prices of various commodities in the hotels for foreign visitors are more than 50 percent lower than the usual market price, Mr. Loh said.

Another example of Communist "showcase" methods was provided at the time of the visit of the Dalai Lama to Red China in the early 1950's, Mr. Loh explained. Two of the biggest Buddhist temples in Shanghai, used by the Chinese Communists as government offices, were evacuated and repaired at a cost of about a quarter of a million U.S. dollars shortly before the Dalai Lama's arrival in an obvious attempt to impress him.

Mr. Loh added that the Chinese Communist officials, who had persecuted the Buddhist as well as other religions, contacted leading Buddhists in Shanghai prior to the Dalai Lama's arrival in an effort to win their sympathy. They gave the Buddhist priests instructions on what to say to the Dalai Lama in conversation and how to act in receiving him.

Mr. Loh stated that visitors to Red China, asking to see the homes of an "average" Chinese family, are taken to preselected "showcases."

When Mr. Loh was a receptionist, he added, he was sometimes taken aside by visitors and asked his impressions of the Chinese Communist government. He testified:

> Under such circumstances how could I tell him [the visitor] the truth?
>
> So I just told him that I loved the Communist Party and the government more than my life.
>
> Because after each of the visits of the foreign visitors, you see, we were questioned in detail by the committee about what they asked and what we said. You cannot tell a lie to them. They will find it out.
>
> * * * So whatever the foreign visitors ask, they are bound to hear lies. No truth can be heard. We had been thoroughly trained and prepared so that we talked as if we were really sincere.

Mr. Loh concluded by pointing out that the deception practiced by the Red Chinese on foreign visitors is likewise practiced by the Communists in Russia, as he learned on a visit to the Soviet Union in 1957.

CHAPTER V

PUBLICATIONS

During the year 1960, the committee printed approximately 332,000 copies of its hearings, consultations, and reports. Several publications were reprinted because of heavy, continuing demand for them after the original printings had been exhausted. Thousands of other documents printed in previous years were also distributed.

Following is a list of committee hearings, consultations, and reports for the 2d session of the 86th Congress:

HEARINGS

Issues Presented by Air Reserve Center Training Manual, February 25, 1960.

Communist Training Operations (Communist Activities and Propaganda Among Youth Groups), Part 2, February 2 and 3, 1960.

Communist Training Operations (Communist Activities and Propaganda Among Youth Groups), Part 3, February 4 and 5 and March 2, 1960.

Communist Espionage in the United States: Testimony of Frantisek Tisler, Former Military and Air Attaché, Czechoslovak Embassy in Washington, D.C., May 10, 1960.

Testimony of Anthony Krchmarek and Charles Musil, May 26, 1960.

The Northern California District of the Communist Party: Structure—Objectives—Leadership, Part 1, May 12, 1960; Part 2, May 13, 1960; Part 3, May 14 and June 10, 1960; Part 4, Appendix.

Communist Activities Among Seamen and on Waterfront Facilities, Part 1, June 6, 7, 8, and 23, 1960.

Communist Penetration of Radio Facilities (Conelrad—Communications), Part 1, August 23 and 24, 1960.

Testimony of Captain Nikolai Fedorovich Artamonov (Former Soviet Naval Officer), September 14, 1960.

CONSULTATIONS[1]

The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 5. Mr. Joseph Pauco, Father Theodoric Joseph Zubek, Mr. Nuci Kotta, and Mr. Arshi Pipa, December 17, 1959.

The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 6. Mr. Rusi Nasar, Mr. Ergacsh Schermatoglu, Mr. Constant Mierlak, Dr. Vitaut Tumash, and Mr. Anton Shukeloyts, December 17, 1959.

The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 7. Mr. Guivy Zaldastani, Mr. George Nakashidse, Mr. Dimitar K. Petkoff, and Mrs. Catherine Boyan Choukanoff, January 8, 1960.

[1] A short biographical sketch of each consultant will be found on the first page of the summary of each consultation.

Lest We Forget!: A Pictorial Summary of Communism in Action. Mr. Klaus Samuli Gunnar Romppanen, January 13, 1960.
Soviet "Justice": "Showplace" Prisons vs. Real Slave Labor Camps. Mr. Adam Joseph Galinski, April 4, 1960.
Communist Economic Warfare. Dr. Robert Loring Allen, April 6, 1960.
How the Chinese Reds Hoodwink Visiting Foreigners. Mr. Robert Loh, April 21, 1960.

REPORTS

Communist Target—Youth: Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics, July 1960.
The Communist-Led Riots Against the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco, Calif., May 12–14, 1960, H. Rept. 2228, October 7, 1960.
World Communist Movement: Selective Chronology 1818–1957, Volume 1, 1818–1945, August 1960.
Facts on Communism: Vol. II—The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev, December 1960.
Legislative Recommendations by House Committee on Un-American Activities, December 1960.
Annual Report for 1960.

CHAPTER VI

REFERENCE SERVICE

During the past year there has been a greater demand than ever before by the Members of Congress for the special reference service offered by the committee—a reference service dealing with information taken entirely from public source material and limited to information within the committee's field of work.

In response to over 2,200 requests from Members of Congress in 1960, the reference staff ran information checks on the names of 4,566 individuals and approximately 1,900 organizations and periodicals, along with a few more general subjects. These checks developed references to material on 1,389 individuals and 556 other subjects. All indicated sources were assembled, carefully reviewed and separate, written reports were prepared on a total of 1,945 subjects.

This represents an increase at all points over comparable service in 1959, the two greatest gains being a 27 percent increase in number of inquiries handled and a 50 percent increase in number of subjects checked for information. A smaller percentage increase in the number of reports prepared is also significant since, due to the volume of available material, more than a day is often required to prepare a single report.

Every effort is made in writing reports to present each reference in a simple, straightforward manner, without comment other than to indicate official Federal agency citations on the organizations and periodicals mentioned; to state clearly the source of each reference; and to include only that information which relates to officially cited organizations and publications and which appears in committee publications, the Communist and Communist-front press, or primary source material on file. No attempt is made to evaluate material so reported, since the committee's official opinions are to be found only in its published reports.

The extent and value of this reference service is underscored by the nature of the extensive collection of material available for consultation. Bound volumes of the committee's own 450 published hearings and reports are on the shelves, together with many issued by other Federal and State committees, a variety of directories, and other standard reference works. The periodical files contain approximately 1,600 separate titles, among which are a number of complete sets of issues, either in the original or on microfilm. There are innumerable letterheads, leaflets, bulletins, and other types of literature issued by subversive organizations in the files. Pamphlets alone number well over 3,000. Information on specific subjects in this extensive collection can be checked due to the detailed indexing and cross-referencing of material and its filing under an expandable subject-heading system, with headings so grouped as to accommodate current additions into files of material assembled over many years.

The reference collection is also consulted frequently to answer inquiries from committee staff members who are furnished with reference information as varied as their types of work and special needs. In response to a total of 1,437 requests from staff members in 1960, checks were run on 3,055 individuals, 815 organizations and periodicals and many general subjects. Verbal reports were furnished on approximately 1,000 subjects; reports were compiled and furnished in writing on 1,222 other subjects; 1,290 pieces of source material were located and reproduced for use as exhibits in investigations and hearings, and selected material on almost 100 general subjects was assembled for the use of staff members.

The reference collection also serves many investigative agencies of the executive branch of our Government whose representatives are regularly admitted, four days a week, for the purpose of checking the committee's records, indexes and publications. Although there can be no true statistical measure of the extent and value of this service, Federal agency representatives made approximately 2,000 visits to the reference section in 1960 with more than two-thirds of such visits on on a full day basis. Their questions, for the most part involving an explanation of committee records or the location of material, were answered at the rate of about 40 per week.

The appreciable gains in the use of the committee's reference service, the steady addition of source material to its files and the appreciation expressed by many of those it has served are an indication of the service's value to the Congress and the Nation.

CHAPTER VII

CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings in San Juan, Puerto Rico, November 18–20, 1959. Thirteen witnesses refused to answer pertinent questions, basing their refusal to answer not on the usual constitutional grounds, but on the ground that the committee lacked jurisdiction to hold hearings in Puerto Rico.

They were: *Jose Enamorado Cuesta*, *Manuel Arroyo Zeppenfeldt*, *Juan Saez Corales*, *Consuelo Burgos De Pagan*, *John Peter Hawes*, *Gertrudis Melendez Perez*, *Ramon Diaz Cruz*, *Frank Ruiz*, *Juan Emmanuelli Morales*, *Cesar Andreu Iglesias*, *Pablo M. Garcia Rodriguez*, *Cristino Perez Mendez*, and *Juan Santos Rivera*.

House contempt resolutions in 1960 were certified by the Speaker of the House and forwarded to the United States Attorney for the District of Puerto Rico for prosecutive action.

CASES PENDING

There are presently awaiting trial in the various United States District Courts, the following cases:

Peter Seeger, New York, N.Y.
Elliott Sullivan, New York, N.Y.
George Tyne, New York, N.Y.
Robert Lehrer, Gary, Ind.
Victor Malis, Gary, Ind.
Alfred James Samter, Gary, Ind.
Harvey O'Connor, Newark, N.J.
Martin Popper, Washington, D.C.

The contempt citation against *Edwin A. Alexander* was presented to the Grand Jury at Chicago, Ill., on April 4, 1960, and a No True Bill was returned.

The decisions of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the cases of *Frank Grumman* and *Bernard Silber* have not been announced as this report goes to press. *Frank Grumman* was convicted on March 15, 1960, and sentenced to 4 months' imprisonment and fined $100. At the time of the hearing before this committee, he was employed as a radio operator for RCA Communications, Inc., but was then currently on temporary leave of absence for union work as secretary-treasurer of Local 10 of the American Communications Association. *Bernard Silber* was convicted on March 23, 1960, and was sentenced to 4 months' imprisonment and fined $100. He was a service writer for the Western Union Telegraph Company.

Sidney Turoff, a former member of the State Committee of the Communist Party of the State of New York, was convicted on December 14, 1959, and sentenced to 60 days' imprisonment and a fine of $100.00. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, to which the conviction was appealed, has not handed down its decision.

Edward Yellin was convicted for refusing to answer questions with reference to the policy of the Communist Party of sending "colonizers" into the steel industry and with reference to his own Communist Party membership, basing his refusal to answer on the first amendment to the Constitution. Mr. Yellin had gone to Gary, Ind., from New York in 1949 and secured employment in the steel industry. He was convicted March 3, 1960, and sentenced to one year in jail and fined $250. His appeal is now pending in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DECISIONS

On June 18, 1960, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia affirmed the conviction of the following:

John T. Gojack, general vice president of United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment and a $500 fine.

Norton Anthony Russell, an employee of Vernay Laboratories, an affiliate of Antioch College at Dayton, Ohio, sentenced to 30 days' imprisonment and a $500 fine.

Bernhard Deutch, formerly a graduate student at Cornell University, sentenced to 90 days' imprisonment and a $100 fine, the fine being remitted. On October 10, 1960, the Supreme Court granted a writ of certiorari in this case. (*See* Supreme Court, *infra.*)

The conviction of *Goldie E. Watson*, an elementary teacher in the Martha Washington Public School of Philadelphia, Pa., sentenced to 3 months' imprisonment and a $1,000 fine, was reversed with instructions to the District Court to dismiss the indictment on the ground that a sufficient explanation of the pertinency of the questions she had refused to answer had not been made to the defendant under the rule in the *Watkins* case.

Donald C. Wheeldin, a former writer for the West Coast newspaper, the People's World, was convicted on October 17, 1959, and sentenced to 30 days' imprisonment and a $100 fine. The conviction was affirmed by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on October 17, 1960.

SUPREME COURT CASES

Writs of certiorari were granted by the Supreme Court of the United States in the cases of *Carl Braden*, *Frank Wilkinson*, and *Bernhard Deutch.*

Carl Braden and *Frank Wilkinson* were convicted in the District Court in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 30, 1959, and both were sentenced to serve one year in jail. Their convictions in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit were affirmed in December 1959. Both of these cases have been argued before the Supreme Court but, as yet, the Supreme Court has not handed down its decisions.

On November 14, 1960, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the conviction of *Arthur McPhaul.*

Mr. McPhaul had been convicted and sentenced on March 8, 1957, by the District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to 9 months' imprisonment and a fine of $500.

The Supreme Court held that McPhaul's failure to state legitimate reasons for failing to produce the records of the Civil Rights Congress was a patent evasion of the duty of one summoned to produce papers before a congressional committee and could not be condoned. In considering the form of the subpena, the Court also held that the breadth of the subpena was not such as to violate the fourth amendment. It is pertinent to note that in the course of the opinion, the Court stated:

> The Fifth Amendment does not excuse the petitioner from producing the records of the Civil Rights Congress, for it is well settled that books and records kept "in a representative rather than in a personal capacity cannot be the subject of the personal privilege against self-incrimination, even though production of the papers might tend to incriminate [their keeper] personally." *United States* v. *White*, 322 U.S. 694, 699 (1944).

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

This committee has made a number of legislative recommendations on several subjects within the area of its responsibilities. The necessity for remedial legislation on these subjects is apparent, but the final form which such legislation should take has been, in some instances, a matter for continuing refinement and development. Final agreement is not always achieved in one session of the Congress. But due deliberation is a legislative virtue. This committee is aware of the serious problems involved in the evolution of suitable and effective legislation as we gird ourselves to face and subdue subversion. In this day and age legislation for this purpose is clearly justified and rests upon "the right of self-preservation, 'the ultimate value of any society'." (Mr. Justice Harlan, in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, 360 U.S. 109, at 127f.) History must not record that this generation has negligently left its patrimony of liberty to be taken from it by those who pass in the shadows.

In 1958 this committee stated:

> The committee is encouraged by the fact that its work has contributed to important remedial legislation in the field of subversion. * * *
>
> This record will also refute once and for all the assertions made by uninformed persons that this committee has no legislative purpose or that the object of its hearings is "exposure for exposure's sake." The facts clearly show that this committee's activities have always been directed toward remedial legislation in its assigned field of inquiry. Congressional approval of the functioning of the committee is exemplified by the vast amount of legislation which has followed its recommendations. (Foreword to Legislative Recommendations by House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1941–1958, A Research Study by Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, June 1958, p. 1.)

During the past year, an American Bar Association committee declared:

> The record of the HCUA and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security is one of accomplishments and achievements despite the fact they have been the targets of inspired propaganda attacks designed to curb their effectiveness. Continuation of these committees is essential to the enactment of sound security legislation. (Report July 1, 1960, Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives, American Bar Association.)

This committee, as the result of continuing study, is of the opinion that there is present need for adoption of remedial legislation on the following subjects:

I. PASSPORT SECURITY

This committee recommends the adoption of legislation authorizing the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons whose purpose in traveling abroad is to engage in activities which will advance the objectives of the Communist conspiracy. We are joined in this recommendation by the Department of State. In a letter to the chairman, dated November 19, 1959, William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary, said:

> The Department believes that the most critical problem in the passport field is the lack of legislative authority in the Secretary of State to deny passports to dangerous participants in the international Communist conspiracy. The Department strongly supports Congressional action directed toward granting such authority to the Secretary.

Such legislation has likewise been recommended by the American Bar Association Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives (Report July 1, 1960).

On June 16, 1958, in the cases of *Kent and Briehl* v. *Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116, and *Dayton* v. *Dulles*, 357 U.S. 144, in 5–4 divided opinions, the Supreme Court decided that the Secretary of State, although acting pursuant to his published regulations, was not authorized to deny passports to participants in the Communist movement whose travel abroad would be inimical to our national interests. These decisions were founded on the premise that the regulations were not based on specific legislative authorization. *Dayton's* case is notable. He was a native-born citizen and physicist who had been connected with various Federal projects. He applied in March 1954 for a passport to enable him to travel to India to accept a position as research physicist at Tata Institute of Fundamental Research. His passport application was denied, based on findings by the Secretary of State that Dayton was closely associated with events and persons involved in the espionage apparatus of Julius Rosenberg, and that his offer of employment in India was obtained through one Bernard Peters, who had held membership in the Communist Party, renounced his American citizenship, and had engaged in Communist activities here and abroad.

As was pointed out in our Annual Report for the year 1958:

> The serious consequences of these decisions are indicated by the fact that from the 16th day of June 1958, the date of the rendition of the decisions, to the 7th day of November 1958, the State Department granted passports to 596 persons who have records of activity in support of the international Communist movement. Persons granted passports include individuals trained in Moscow, individuals who have been involved in Communist espionage activity, individuals who have performed Communist functions in countries other

than the United States, and, last but not least, Communist Party members, both concealed and open, who owe an undying allegiance to the international Communist conspiracy. When considering the salutary provisions of the Walter-McCarran Act, designed to prevent this country from being overridden by Communist agents from abroad, it is shocking to learn the names of the highly placed Communists in this country who are now permitted to travel indiscriminately in the countries of our Allies, as well as in those of our enemies.

This committee has early recognized the necessity for legislation in this field. In its Annual Report for the year 1956, the committee pointed out that:

> Although recognizing the historic discretion of the Secretary of State to issue, withhold or limit passports under regulations adopted pursuant to Executive orders, the committee believes that the hand of the Secretary should be strengthened by the enactment of legislation expressing the will and intent of the legislative branch of the Government spelled out in direct and positive form.

Several bills on this subject, including H.R. 2232 (Sections 409 to 413, inclusive) by the chairman, were introduced during the 86th Congress. H.R. 9069, introduced on September 3, 1959, was passed by the House of Representatives on September 8, 1959, on which there has been no Senate action. The committee recognizes the difficulty in reaching all the problems in the field of passport law at one time in one bill. We suggest further study of the previous recommendations of this committee and the provisions of other bills presented within the House and Senate in this field, with the object in view that action, at least on certain phases of such legislation, can be accomplished in the next Congress.

II. MISBEHAVIOR OF WITNESSES AND OTHERS BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

This committee strongly recommends legislation amending Secs. 102 and 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 USC, Secs. 192, 194), to prohibit and punish misbehavior of witnesses and others in the presence of, or so near thereto as to obstruct, either House or any committee thereof in the performance of their duties.

We have dealt with this problem more fully in our House Report No. 2228 of October 1960, which was prompted by the outrages perpetrated on this committee at the San Francisco hearings in May 1960. The riots and disorder instigated by the Communist Party within the hearing room and in its vicinity were designed to obstruct the committee and to impair its dignity. There is no doubt that the Communist Party, in theory and practice, has adopted a program to break down the investigative or fact-finding process and all respect for American law, whether in the courts or in committees of the Congress.

62224—60——9

In 1933, the International Labor Defense, which was later cited as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" by Attorney General Biddle, issued its pamphlet No. 5, entitled, "Under Arrest—Workers' Self-Defense in the Courts," which absurdly represented to the party members that the dignity and sanctity of the courts "are a means of paralyzing the struggle of the workers against capitalist institutions." The pamphlet stated: "The worker must learn to carry into the court room the same determined militancy that brought him there." The instructions advocated in this pamphlet, our records indicate, have been precisely followed in the courts and investigative hearings as well. The San Francisco rioting followed the basic and classic pattern set forth in the pamphlet as follows:

> A most important consideration of workers' self-defense as already mentioned, is to use the capitalist courtroom as a forum from which the workers on trial can expose before their fellow toilers the true nature of the courts—as a tool in the bosses' economic and political oppression.
>
> A courtroom packed to the doors with workers during a class trial, on the one hand, serves for the masses of workers as a practical study of class justice in operation; on the other, it strengthens the workers' case as a whole, through the display of solidarity of workers, in the face of the bosses' attack upon their militant workers and leaders. Very often such a court setting has been the decisive feature that won the worker's case.
>
> However, this alone is also not enough. In the average size courtroom 200 or 300 people may crowd in. That's not enough. A worker's case generally comes out of some definite struggle—strike, lockout, demonstration, hunger-march, etc.—involving many hundreds or thousands of workers.

The implied or common-law power of the Houses to punish for contempt is in most instances inadequate. Such procedure is obviously cumbersome, time-consuming, diverts the Congress from its legislative work, is in many cases impractical, and also results in uneven justice. As pointed out in *Anderson* v. *Dunn*, 6 Wheat. 204 (U.S. 1821), such power to punish for contempt is limited to imprisonment for the duration of the session of the House affected by the contempt and does not survive the adjournment or periodic dissolution of the House. In addition, with respect to contempts before committees of the Houses, and not therefore directly in the presence of the assembled Houses, trial and punishment by judicial process with the traditional safeguards of jury trial would seem more desirable. It is also to be noted that the power of the Congress to punish at the bar of the Houses with respect to various forms of contempt of its committees has not been clearly defined by the courts and is in that respect uncertain.

Statutory modes of dealing with contempt of Congress and its committees are limited to the aforementioned sections 192 and 194, which do not proscribe contumacious conduct of witnesses or others except the refusal of the witness to appear or to testify or to produce papers before either House or any committee thereof. Other forms of misbehavior are untouched by statute. These sections relate only to witnesses, and even in the case of witnesses the courts are quite

powerless to punish misconduct with the exceptions noted. In *United States* v. *Starkovich*, 23 USL Week 2490 (WD Wash. 1955), which dismissed an indictment for contempt of this committee which had arisen out of the misconduct of the witness before it, the court said that Starkovich "could have acted in the most objectionable manner possible, used profanity, vulgarisms, vilification of the committee or anything he wanted as long as he answered the questions or rightfully claimed privilege." Moreover, these sections do not at all deal with disorders by counsel or others whether within or without the hearing room.

In arguing for this specific legislative power to punish misbehavior we cannot do better than to borrow the words of Mr. Justice Johnson, who wrote in reply to the argument that the Congress did not possess an implied power to punish for contempt, that a denial of such power—

> obviously leads to the total annihilation of the power of the House of Representatives to guard itself from contempts, and leaves it exposed to every indignity and interruption, that rudeness, caprice, or even conspiracy, may meditate against it. This result is fraught with too much absurdity, not to bring into doubt the soundness of any argument from which it is derived. That a deliberate assembly, clothed with the majesty of the people, and charged with the care of all that is dear to them; composed of the most distinguished citizens, selected and drawn together from every quarter of a great nation; whose deliberations are required by public opinion, to be conducted under the eye of the public, and whose decisions must be clothed with all that sanctity which unlimited confidence in their wisdom and purity can inspire; that such an assembly should not possess the power to suppress rudeness, or repel insult, is a supposition too wild to be suggested. (*Anderson* v. *Dunn*, supra, p. 228.)

To remedy the situation, the chairman introduced H.R. 2232 on January 12, 1959, which by Sec. 302 thereof would amend Secs. 102 and 104 of the Revised Statutes to include every person who misbehaves in the presence of either House or its committees, or who misbehaves so near thereto as to obstruct such House or committee in the performance of its duties. In support of this legislation we would again borrow the language of Mr. Justice Johnson in *Anderson* v. *Dunn*, supra, p. 226:

> But if there is one maxim which necessarily rides over all others, in the practical application of government, it is, that the public functionaries must be left at liberty to exercise the powers which the people have intrusted to them. The interests and dignity of those who created them, require the exertion of the powers indispensable to the attainment of the ends of their creation. Nor is a casual conflict with the rights of particular individuals any reason to be urged against the exercise of such powers. The wretch beneath the gallows may repine at the fate which awaits him, and yet it is no less certain, that the laws under which he suffers were made for his security. The unreasonable murmurs of individuals against the restraints of society, have a direct tendency to

produce that worst of all despotisms, which makes every individual the tyrant over his neighbor's rights. That "the safety of the people is the supreme law," not only comports with, but is indispensable to, the exercise of those powers in their public functionaries without which that safety cannot be guarded. On this principle it is, that courts of justice are universally acknowledged to be vested, by their very creation, with power to impose silence, respect and decorum in their presence, and submission to their lawful mandates, and as a corollary to this proposition, to preserve themselves and their officers from the approach and insults of pollution.

III. THE SMITH ACT

It is recommended that the Smith Act be strengthened by appropriate legislation defining the term "organize" to include continuing acts of organizing and recruiting.

The Smith Act, as amended, provides that:

> Whoever knowingly or willfully advocates, abets, advises, or teaches the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying the government of the United States or the government of any State, Territory, District or Possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein, by force or violence, or by the assassination of any officer of any such government; or
>
> Whoever, with intent to cause the overthrow or destruction of any such government, prints, publishes, edits, issues, circulates, sells, distributes, or publicly displays any written or printed matter advocating, advising, or teaching the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence, or attempts to do so; or
>
> Whoever organizes or helps or attempts to organize any society, group, or assembly of persons who teach, advocate, or encourage the overthrow or destruction of any such government by force or violence; or becomes or is a member of, or affiliates with, any such society, group, or assembly of persons, knowing the purposes thereof—
>
> Shall be fined, etc: (18 U.S.C., sec. 2385).

In *Yates* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 298 (1957), which was a prosecution under the Smith Act, charging certain leading Communists, inter alia, with conspiracy to organize as the Communist Party of the United States a society of persons who advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing this Government by force and violence as speedily as circumstances would permit, the court decided that "since the Communist Party came into being in 1945, and the indictment was not returned until 1951, the three-year Statute of Limitations had run on the 'organizing' charge, and required the withdrawal of that part of the indictment from the jury's consideration." (Actually, the Communist Party in the United States was merely reconstituted in that year. It had in fact existed at least since 1919.) The court rejected the Government's contention that the word "organize" connotes a continuing process which goes on throughout the life of an organization, and held that, the statute being penal, the term should

be construed in its narrow meaning as referring only to acts entering into the creation of a new organization, and not to acts thereafter performed in carrying on its activities. It is therefore apparent that an important concept of the Smith Act has been shown deficient by this decision. The deficiency may be remedied by amendment, such as was offered by the chairman of this committee in H.R. 2369, passed by the House on March 2, 1959, but which did not come to a vote in the Senate. If the Smith Act is to remain one of our most effective weapons against the Communist conspiracy, it is vital that this statute be improved.

Perhaps more disappointing is the majority decision on other points of this case, particularly what Mr. Justice Clark in his dissent points out to be "an exercise in semantics and indulgence in distinctions too 'subtle and difficult to grasp'." (p. 350.) The trial court had clearly charged that the holding of a belief or opinion did not constitute advocacy or teaching; that the Smith Act did not prohibit persons who may believe that the violent overthrow of the Government is probable or inevitable from expressing that belief; and that any advocacy or teaching which did not include the urging of force or violence as the means of overthrowing the Government was not within the issue of the indictment. The trial court further told the jury that:

> The kind of advocacy and teaching which is charged and upon which your verdict must be reached is not merely a desirability but a necessity that the Government of the United States be overthrown and destroyed by force and violence and not merely a propriety but a duty to overthrow and destroy the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Yet the majority of the Supreme Court reversed a trial of 4 months' duration and held that this charge was inadequate; that the court should have added expressions that such advocacy and teaching must be a call to action and done—

> with the intent that such teaching and advocacy be of a rule or principle of action and by language reasonably and ordinarily calculated to incite persons to such action * * *.

This is a distinction without a difference. A flyspeck had been found on the bay window. Is not the imposition of a duty a call to action and a "principle" of action? It is stronger: it imposes an obligation to act. Is not the advocacy of that duty, as necessity, together with the *urging* of force and violence, an intentional incitement? This was, in effect, long ago recognized by Justice Holmes, who wrote:

> It is said that this manifesto was more than a theory, that it was an incitement. It offers itself for belief and if believed it is acted on unless some other belief outweighs it or some failure of energy stifles the movement at its birth. The only difference between the expression of an opinion and an incitement in the narrower sense is the speaker's enthusiasm for the result. (*Gitlow* v. *New York*, 268 U.S. 652, at p. 673.)

But, it must be emphasized, the trial court went further and required the jury to find an advocacy of duty, the advocacy of necessity to overthrow by force and violence and an *urging* of force and violence,

which in the common understanding of the English language is obviously more than an expression of opinion or of abstract doctrine.

The view of Justice Black, with whom Justice Douglas joined concurring in part and dissenting in part in the *Yates* case, suggests that the first amendment gives an absolute and unqualified privilege of speech. He said, at p. 340:

> Under the Court's approach, defendants could still be convicted simply for agreeing to talk as distinguished from agreeing to act. I believe that the First Amendment forbids Congress to punish people for talking about public affairs, *whether or not such discussion incites to action, legal or illegal.* [Italics supplied.]

What public affairs? All? He then quoted from the Statute for Religious Liberty of 1785, written by Thomas Jefferson, "it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government, for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order * * *." But this was religion. What we are talking about in Yates is a type of Hitlerism: an existing organization of party members, a veritable army of vermin, fully indoctrinated with treason, already deployed in strategic sectors of American life, actually engaged in espionage, recruiting new members by speech on every available platform, meeting in assemblies, acting in conspiratorial concert by a thoroughly organized system of communication in this very speech and writing, ready to act, recognizing a duty to act, and which will act when the signal for the putsch is given from headquarters in Moscow. (See *Dennis* v. *United States*, 341 U.S. 494, at p. 509.) Their "talk" *is* an agreement to act; just as their comrades in all parts of the world have acted and are now acting on that very same talk.

The view of Justice Black does not accord with the decisions of the intellectual giants of jurisprudence, Holmes and Brandeis, who have never recognized the first amendment or any other clause of the Constitution as giving, under any and all circumstances, in any and all "public affairs," an unqualified right for this kind of speech. In *Whitney* v. *California*, 274 U.S. 357 (1927), the court dealt with a statute of California, in substance identical to the organizing and membership section of the Smith Act, which provides that:

> Any person who * * * Organizes or assists in organizing, or is or knowingly becomes a member of, any organization, society, group or assemblage of persons organized or assembled to advocate, teach or aid and abet criminal syndicalism * * * Is guilty of a felony * * *.

Miss Whitney was convicted of the felony of assisting in organizing in the year 1919 the Communist Labor Party of California, of being a member of it, and of assembling with it. The conviction was sustained by a unanimous court on appeal. Justice Brandeis, in a separate concurring opinion with which Justice Holmes joined, said at p. 373:

> The right of free speech, the right to teach and the right of assembly are, of course, fundamental rights. * * * But,

> although the rights of free speech and assembly are fundamental, they are not in their nature absolute. Their exercise is subject to restriction, if the particular restriction proposed is required in order to protect the State from destruction or from serious injury, political, economic or moral. That the necessity which is essential to a valid restriction does not exist unless speech would produce, or is intended to produce, a clear and imminent danger of some substantive evil which the State constitutionally may seek to prevent has been settled.

He found that in the case of Miss Whitney there was testimony which "tended to establish the existence of a conspiracy, on the part of members of the International Workers of the World, to commit present serious crimes; and likewise to show that such a conspiracy would be furthered by the activity of the society of which Miss Whitney was a member." (p. 379.) The testimony in the *Yates* case tended to establish the same facts.

Justice Brandeis was perfectly willing to uphold the validity of this California statute even though as he said, at p. 373:

> The mere act of assisting in forming a society for teaching syndicalism, of becoming a member of it, or of assembling with others for that purpose is given the dynamic quality of crime. There is guilt although the society may not contemplate immediate promulgation of the doctrine. Thus the accused is to be punished, not for contempt, incitement or conspiracy, but for a step in preparation, which, if it threatens the public order at all, does so only remotely. The novelty in the prohibition introduced is that the statute aims, not at the practice of criminal syndicalism, nor even directly at the preaching of it, but at association with those who propose to preach it.

He then dealt with the test for determining the validity of the prohibition. He said, at p. 379:

> Whether in 1919, when Miss Whitney did the things complained of, there was in California such clear and present danger of serious evil, might have been made the important issue in the case. She might have required that the issue be determined either by the court or the jury. She claimed below that the statute as applied to her violated the Federal Constitution; but she did not claim that it was void because there was no clear and present danger of serious evil, nor did she request that the existence of these conditions of a valid measure thus restricting the rights of free speech and assembly be passed upon by the court or a jury. On the other hand, there was evidence on which the court or jury might have found that such danger existed.

As Justice Holmes pointed out in *Schenck* v. *United States*, 249 U.S. 47, at p. 52 (1918), "We admit that in many places and in ordinary times the defendants in saying all that was said in the circu-

lar would have been within their constitutional rights. But the character of every act depends upon the circumstances in which it is done." Can anyone deny that a danger to the United States exists in the international Communist conspiracy? Can anyone deny that this danger is today clear? Can anyone say that the danger is not imminent? One has only to be alive and read the newspapers to recognize these facts.

IV. FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SECURITY PROGRAM

It is urgently recommended that legislation be passed to stem the serious breach in the Federal Employee Security Program opened by the decision in *Cole* v. *Young*, 351 U.S. 536 (1956).

The act of August 26, 1950, gave to the heads of certain departments and agencies of the Government the power summarily to suspend any civilian officer or employee "when deemed necessary in the interest of national security." The act, inter alia, further provided that the employee concerned, to the extent that the interests of national security permit, shall be notified of the reasons for suspension; that the employee shall have an opportunity to submit his reply; that permanent employees who are citizens shall have the further right to request a hearing; that his employment thereafter may be terminated if the agency head determines such action necessary or advisable in the interest of national security and that such determination by the agency head shall be conclusive and final. The act authorized the President to extend the provisions of this act from time to time to such other agencies of the Government as he shall deem necessary in the best interests of national security.

In October 1953, by Executive Order 10450, the President deemed it necessary to extend the provisions of this act to all other departments and agencies of the Government. Cole, a food and drug inspector, employed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was charged with having continued a close association with persons reported to be Communists and of maintaining a sympathetic association with an organization known as Nature Friends of America, designated as subversive by the Attorney General, and with having, by his own admission, donated funds to that group, contributed services and attended social gatherings of it. Cole did not answer the charges. He replied that they constituted an invasion of his private rights of association and, although advised that he could have a hearing, requested none. The Secretary of that Department made a formal determination that Cole's continued employment was not "clearly consistent with the interests of the national security," and dismissed him.

The Supreme Court, with Justices Clark, Reed, and Minton dissenting, on June 11, 1956, reversed the dismissal of Cole and held that the standard prescribed by the Executive order and applied by the Secretary was not in conformity with the act. Justice Harlan, for the majority, argued that a dismissal deemed necessary or advisable in the interests of the national security requires evaluation not only of the character of the employee, but also of the nature of the position he occupies; that the term "national security" is used in the act in a limited sense and relates only to those activities directly concerned with the Nation's safety, as distinguished from the general welfare,

and applies only to "sensitive" positions. He argued that a proper interpretation of the act requires such a determination of the character of the position and that, since none was made by the Secretary as to the position occupied by Cole, his dismissal was improper. The majority thus cut down the applicability of the act to "sensitive" positions only.

Justice Clark, with whom Justices Reed and Minton joined, dissenting declared, "We have read the Act over and over again, but find no ground on which to infer such an interpretation. It flies directly in the face of the language of the Act and the legislative history." (p. 566.) He added, at p. 569, that:

> We believe the Court's order has stricken down the most effective weapon against subversive activity available to the Government. It is not realistic to say that the Government can be protected merely by applying the Act to sensitive jobs. One never knows just which job is sensitive. The janitor might prove to be in as important a spot security-wise as the top employee in the building. The Congress decided that the most effective way to protect the Government was through the procedures laid down in the Act. * * * They should not be subverted by the technical interpretation the majority places on them today.

The reasoning of the majority, while persuasive, is specious, and resulted in a bold frustration of congressional intent and executive policy. As Chairman Walter testified in the hearings before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service (on bills to amend the Act of August 26, 1950, held April, May and June 1959):[1]

> On the floor of the House, Mr. Holifield said, in opposing the extent of the applicability of this statute: "This act applies potentially to every executive agency, not only the sensitive ones."
>
> This was the objection raised by the opponents of this legislation, that it was all-inclusive, so that there can be no question of the congressional intent. * * *
>
> We intended that we were going to rid ourselves in the Government of this kind of employee. The case of *Cole* v. *Young*, in my judgment, is the most striking example of the invasion by the Court of the legislative prerogative that I have seen in many years. * * *
>
> This great Republic of ours is as strong as it is because of the integrity of the three branches of our Government. If it is to remain strong, then it is our duty to see to it that each one of the three branches is protected from an invasion by either of the other two branches.
>
> *Cole* v. *Young* not only ignored the very plain intent of the Congress but it went further in its legislative activity, and that is what this was. It added the language "in a sensitive position."
>
> Members of this committee, I have examined the record from the time this matter was first taken up and I have yet to

[1] "Federal Employees Security Program," hearings before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

find the word "sensitive" anywhere in any of the hearings or discussions apropos of this legislation. (pp. 8, 9.)

At the conclusion of Mr. Walter's testimony, Chairman Tom Murray of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, said to Mr. Walter:

> I might state that I was the author of the original bill on which this legislation is based. * * *
>
> The bill was brought to me by Secretary of the Navy Dan Kimball. We conferred at length about it and, throughout our discussions, there was no mention of any sensitive position.
>
> It was my understanding, and that of Secretary Kimball, that this legislation would cover all employees of the Government, regardless of what position they held, whether in the most sensitive position of the Government or whether they were just in the custodial service; and certainly the Supreme Court, when it held in the case of *Cole* v. *Young* that this legislation applied only to sensitive positions, was actually going contrary to my views when I was author of the original bill (p. 9).

As the result of the majority decision in *Cole* v. *Young*, 109 persons were restored from termination or suspension of their employment. As of April 24, 1959, there were still 74 of these security risks on the employment rolls. Back pay awarded, without the benefit to the Government of loyal services, amounted to $579,656.55. (See table, p. 6, aforesaid hearings before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.)

In order to correct the shocking situation created by the decision, the chairman of this committee introduced H.R. 1989 on January 9, 1959. Such legislation as this is now necessary to clarify congressional purpose. It must be made clear that the President, in whom is reposed the constitutional power and responsibility of executing laws and appointing for that purpose those who will faithfully serve that end, shall have, as intended, a summary power of suspension and removal of those who are disloyal and security risks, under reasonable safeguards to the individual, not compromising our intelligence activities or imposing undue burdens upon the exercise of administrative discretion, and without regard to whether or not an employee occupies a position commonly but often mistakenly described as non-sensitive. To intimate that such a power will not be decently exercised, is an unwarranted slur upon our great body of able administrators. We also recommend further study of more comprehensive legislation on this subject, so that eventually a civilian employee loyalty and security program may be enacted along lines proposed by the former Wright Commission on Government Security.

In these critical times there is no place in Government, in any of its departments and agencies, except for those who are clearly loyal to the institutions of this free society. We cannot afford the luxury of sapping the vitality and effectiveness of this Government which must remain strong, for its purpose is to preserve and defend the freedom of the American people and the institutions of the free world. We are already locked in fateful struggle with the enemies of freedom at home and in areas all over the globe. In the defense of our free-

doms we have also enlisted the support of our youth and our treasure in our Army, Navy, and Air Force; we have imposed upon them strict standards of duty and loyalty; we see them daily risking and even sacrificing their lives in training, tests, and deployments. It is intolerable that we should permit a betrayal of the vanguard by any of those in the rear. There is no place in the Government of the United States for one single disloyal person. It is not too much to ask that our employees be and remain like Caesar's wife, above suspicion. It is monstrous that the "Coles" should be milking the United States Treasury, enjoying their "freedom of association" with traitors, while others make untold sacrifices to maintain them.

V. INDUSTRIAL SECURITY

It is urgently recommended that Congress authorize the President to prescribe regulations, relating to Government contracts with industry, creating industrial personnel security clearance programs, to assure the preservation and integrity of classified information, and reposing in the President a summary or discretionary power to deny clearance, without judicial review, to those not clearly loyal or who may be security risks, with authority to subpena witnesses to testify under oath in matters relating to any investigation or hearing provided for by such regulations.

This committee has established through reliable testimony received in numerous hearings that the Communist Party has deliberately infiltrated basic industry, including of course industry engaged in defense production involving highly classified projects of the military establishments. For example, Mr. John Lautner, an active Communist Party member for more than 20 years prior to his expulsion from the party in 1950, who held high Communist Party office on the national level, testified that as far back as 1932 the Communist Party in the U.S.A. embarked upon a program called "Face to the Shop," which was designed to infiltrate basic industry. He traced the development of that program and testified that in 1948, Henry Winston, who was the organization director of the Communist Party, later convicted in the first Smith Act case, gave a report on the party policy of concentration in basic industry and was able to say "that the reorganization already resulted in establishing over 3,000 Communist Party branches throughout the country, a whole slew of industrial sections, and between 400 and 500 industrial branches were established by the 1948 convention." Mr. Lautner further testified that most of these party members came from colleges and universities, were young men who were convinced that a so-called bourgeois education and diploma had no future, and had uprooted themselves and become professional revolutionaries, with an objective of colonizing industry. (See Investigation of Communist Infiltration and Propaganda Activities in Basic Industry, Gary, Indiana, Area, Hearings held February 10 and 11, 1958.)

Penetration by the Communist Party into specific private facilities such as the vital communications industry has likewise been clearly established in hearings. For example, the Government has leased cables or lines in the radio industry over which are transmitted classified information emanating in part from the Pentagon and the State Department, to which Communist workers in that industry have had

access and which are subject to espionage and sabotage. Actual purposeful infiltration into these industries by known and identified Communists has also been indisputably described in hearings. (See Investigation of Communist Penetration of Communications Facilities, Part 1, Hearings held July–August 1957; Communist Penetration of Radio Facilities (Conelrad—Communications) Part 1, Hearings held Aug. 23 and 24, 1960; Problems of Security in Industrial Establishments Holding Defense Contracts, Greater Pittsburgh Area—Part 2, Hearings held March 11, 1959.)

The executive branch of the Government has been aware of the serious danger to internal security by reason of Communist infiltration of industry holding defense contracts. The Defense Department for some years had had an industrial clearance or security program. However, the winds blowing from the Supreme Court in a series of decisions—some of which are dealt with in this report and are unfavorable to the Government security and loyalty programs—finally in *Greene* v. *McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474, decided June 29, 1959, toppled the security program of the Defense Department. This has led Justice Clark to remark, in his dissent, at p. 524, "Let us hope that the winds may change. If they do not the present temporary debacle will turn into a rout of our internal security."

Greene had begun his employment in 1937 with the Engineer and Research Corporation, which is a business devoted mainly to the development and manufacture of mechanical and electronic products. He was first employed as a junior engineer and at the time of his discharge by this corporation in 1953 was vice president and general manager. He had been credited with the development of a complicated electronic flight simulator and with the design of a rocket launcher, produced by this corporation and used by the Navy. The corporation was engaged in classified contract work for the various services, and had entered into a security agreement or contract by which the corporation agreed, in the performance of this work, to provide and maintain a system of security controls and that it would not permit any individual to have access to classified matter unless cleared by the Government. During the World War II period, Greene had received security clearance but finally, in 1951, information had come to the attention of the Government which, as indicated in the footnotes to the case, clearly showed that Greene was a security risk, if not actually disloyal to the United States.

A letter of charges was delivered to Greene and he was informed that he could seek a hearing before the review board. He appeared with counsel, was questioned and in a series of hearings was given an opportunity to present his witnesses and his case. Greene's own admissions would seem to establish what the Government had reasonably concluded, that he was a security risk, although the Government presented no witnesses and, relying largely on confidential reports, did not give Greene the opportunity to confront and cross-examine persons whose statements reflected on him. But in this type of situation, it is apparent that such confrontation and cross-examination would compromise the Government's intelligence activities, and this fact points up the necessity of summary procedure in dealing with matters of this kind. Greene's security clearance was finally withdrawn and as a result his services were no longer useful to his corporation. He was forced to resign from his offices in the corporation and was discharged by it.

Greene appealed to the District Court, asking for a declaration that the revocation of his security clearance was unlawful and void. The District Court and the Court of Appeals upheld the validity of the revocation, but a majority of the Supreme Court, in a decision by Chief Justice Warren, reversed, and held the revocation of clearance invalid on the ground that the administrative procedures were not explicitly authorized by either Congress or the President. This decision left several basic questions suspended and unanswered. As Chief Justice Warren said, at p. 508:

> Whether those procedures under the circumstances comport with the Constitution we do not decide. Nor do we decide whether the President has inherent authority to create such a program, whether congressional action is necessary, or what the limits on executive or legislative authority may be. We decide only that in the absence of explicit authorization from either the President or Congress the respondents were not empowered to deprive petitioner of his job in a proceeding in which he was not afforded the safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination.

Immediately after the decision in the *Greene* case, the chairman of this committee, on July 7, 1959, introduced in the House H.R. 8121, with a view toward establishing congressional authority for the issuance by the Secretary of Defense of such regulations. This bill was reported out by this committee on September 2, 1959, and passed by the House on February 2, 1960. However, there has been no final Senate action. Further, in order to plug the hole in the dike, the President on February 20, 1960, issued Executive Order No. 10865, giving authority to certain departments, including the Department of Defense, to issue regulations and prescribe requirements for the safeguarding of classified information within industry.

The Executive order sets up a basic and reasonable summary procedure which is designed to give the individual an opportunity to present his case but at the same time protect confidential information. However, whether this Executive order, standing alone, will be sufficient to meet the requirements of the Supreme Court in the *Greene* case, is doubtful because the court in that case expressly stated that it had not decided whether the President alone could lawfully create such a program or whether congressional action was necessary, and had not decided what the limits of such action may be in either case. In an analogous if not identical situation, namely, in the cases of *Kent and Briehl* v. *Dulles* and *Dayton* v. *Dulles*, discussed and cited in this report under Passport Security, the Supreme Court refused to uphold similar regulations of the Secretary of State on the ground that they were not authorized by *Congress*. In the light of these cases and the ambiguous language of the *Greene* case, it is apparent that the Supreme Court as presently constituted would very likely strike down an Executive order not supported by congressional authority, which would open the Government to serious damage claims, as Justice Clark forewarned in his dissent in the *Greene* case. (p. 523f.)

It is the view of this committee that the Congress must take action immediately to lend support to this Executive order or such action as is contemplated and deemed necessary by the Executive. Congressional action is further necessary on this subject so that the President

will be authorized to issue subpenas and compel the presence of witnesses on behalf of the persons concerned as well as on behalf of the Government, which is a deficiency noted in section 6 of the Executive order. Existing law does not authorize the agencies therein mentioned, such as the Department of State and the Department of Defense, to issue compulsory process for witnesses so that the individual concerned may, within limits and not compromising our security, have the opportunity to cross-examine as provided by the order. It is recommended that the President be given express authority to enact such regulations as set forth in the Executive order of February 20, 1960, and with an additional authorization incorporated in the bill granting subpena powers.

VI. OTHER LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

In our Annual Report for 1959 we called attention to other subjects on which legislation may properly be recommended, and we make reference thereto, along with H.R. 2232 which was an omnibus bill introduced by the chairman incorporating other recommendations, including some discussed in this report. Likewise recommended is H.R. 6780, introduced by the chairman April 29, 1959, to amend the Communist Control Act of 1954 to prohibit interference by certain persons with the free movement of defense materials in foreign commerce, and for other purposes. Additionally, in the second session of the 86th Congress, 1960, the chairman of this committee, introduced the following bills which are recommended:

H.R. 11580: To amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to provide that no individual who willfully fails or refuses to answer, or falsely answers, certain questions relating to Communist activities, when summoned to appear before certain Federal agencies, shall be employed on any merchant vessel of the United States or within certain waterfront facilities in the United States.

H.R. 11628: To amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to provide that any Federal officer or employee who willfully fails or refuses to answer, or falsely answers, certain questions relating to Communist activities, when summoned to appear before certain Federal agencies, shall be removed from his office or employment.

H.R. 12753: To amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to require the registration of certain additional persons disseminating political propaganda within the United States as agents of a foreign principal, and for other purposes. (Passed the House on August 22, 1960.)

H.R. 12852: To amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to prohibit the licensing of certain individuals as station operators of certain communication facilities, and for other purposes.

It would also be appropriate here to refer to a revised publication of this committee, a research study by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, titled and setting forth "Legislative Recommendations by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and Subsequent Action Taken by Congress or Executive Agencies,"

for the period 1941–1960. This document is issued concurrently with our Annual Report for the Year 1960, and summarizes every legislative recommendation offered by this committee during that period. From it may be reviewed what has been done, and what may yet remain to be done, by way of legislative action.

VII. CONCLUSION

Does the Committee on Un-American Activities seek exposure for exposure's sake? No. That is Communist semantics. Truth for truth's sake? Yes, but more. Truth, so that we may intelligently and effectively legislate to cope with an established menace, the appalling and fateful challenge of our age. Of course, rightly considered, the educational or informing process is concerned with exposure, when the truth is concealed; and with disclosure, when the truth is to be imparted. We must not permit the incident of exposure, necessarily involved in legislative activity, to be degraded by Communist name-calling, which has for its purpose the suppression of discussion and understanding. The time calls for knowledge and action. Relentlessly, we must continue to breathe down the stiff necks of traitors and enemies within, until that better day is born—which is the fondest hope of America—when the lion lies down with the lamb, and all this will no longer be necessary.

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Alexander, Edwin A	117
Allen, James S	9, 10, 29, 32, 60
Allen, Robert Loring	107–109, 114
Ames, William	85
Anderson (John)	83, 124, 125
Andreu Iglesias, Cesar	117
Arroyo Zeppenfeldt, Manuel	117
Artamonov, Nikolai Fedorovich	34, 73–75, 113
Axelrod, Albert A	78
Baer, John W	38
Barenblatt (Lloyd L.)	121
Becker, Louis	69
Bentley, Elizabeth	21
Bergman, Leibel	58, 79
Beria, Lavrenti	26
Black (Hugo L.)	128
Blodgett, Charles (David)	84–86
Blumenthal, Stanley	73
Boothroyd, Philip D	71, 73
Borrow (Morton)	70, 71
Bown, Vernon	57, 58, 79, 86, 87
Braden, Carl	118
Brandeis (Louis D.)	128, 129
Brandweiner, Heinrich	46
Bridges, Agnes (former wife of Harry Renton Bridges)	84
Bridges, Harry Renton (also known as Harry Dorgan)	84
Briehl (Walter)	122, 135
Brodsky, Merle (also known as Steve Bradley)	59, 63, 78-80, 85
Browder, Earl	39
Brown, Archie	25, 58, 63, 79–81, 84, 87
Budenz, Louis	21, 85
Burgos De Pagan, Consuelo	117
Burnham, Robert F	38
Burov, Nicolai	50
Cahill, Thomas	63
Carberry, Matthew C	63
Casey, Ralph E	66
Castro, Fidel	11
Chambers, Whittaker	21
Choukanoff, Catherine Boyan	100–102, 113
Chrusniak, Marion	67
Clark, Donald H	58
Clark (Tom C.)	127, 130, 131, 134, 135
Clinger, Moiselle J	85
Colcord, Charles Everett	69
Cole (Kendrick M.)	130–132
Dalai Lama	111
Dallin, David J	90, 91
Davis, Benjamin Jr	23, 48, 49
Dawson, Doris	56
Dayton (Weldon Bruce)	122, 135

62224—60——10

	Page
Deirup, Ann	59
Dennis (Eugene)	128
Deutch, Bernhard	118
Dewey (Thomas)	4
Diaz Cruz, Ramon	117
Dorgan, Harry (*See* Bridges, Harry.)	
Douglas (William)	128
DuBois, W. E. B	25
Dulles, Allen W	28, 33
Dulles (John Foster)	122, 135
Dunn (Thomas)	83, 124, 125
Edises, Bertram	80, 85
Eisenhower (Dwight D.)	29, 33
Emmanuelli Morales, Juan	117
Enamorado Cuesta, Jose	117
Erb, Tillman H	59
Eugene, Arthur, Jr	86
Evelyn, Dow E	70, 72
Fast, Howard	23, 24
Figueiredo, Joseph	58
Fishman, Irving	61, 62
Foreman, Clark	51
Foster, William Z	14, 18, 89
Gaillard, Albert	45, 48, 49, 50
Galinski, Adam Joseph	104–107, 114
Garcia Rodriguez, Pablo M	117
Gates, Thomas S., Jr	37, 38
Gitlow, (Benjamin)	127
Globe, (Arthur)	65
Gojack, John T	118
Gold, Michael	13, 14, 15
Goldberg, Murray	73
Goodman, Peter	15, 68
Gould, David Jay	73
Graham, (Edgar W.)	64
Graham, Morris	58, 63, 86
Grant, Joanne Alileen	45, 48, 50
Gray, Jesse	48, 49
Greene (William L.)	134, 135
Guevara, Ernesto ("Che")	11
Grumman, Frank	117
Haddock, Hoyt S	66
Hall, Gus	10, 28, 56
Halpern, Betty (Mrs. Raymond Halpern; nee Weinstein)	59
Harlan (John M.)	121, 130
Harris, Noel	59
Hartle, Barbara	56, 57, 84
Hauser, Stanley Milton	68
Hawes, John Peter	117
Hirschfield, James A	65
Hiss (Alger)	21
Holifield (Chet)	131
Holmes (Oliver Wendell)	127–129
Hoover, J. Edgar	3, 16, 40, 43, 77, 78, 80–82
Hopwood, Lloyd P	38
Ilyinsky, Andrew	44, 45
Izard, Ralph	58, 63, 84
Jackson, Donald William	69
Jackson, James E	11
Jerome, Fred	49
Johnsen, Ralph Kenneth	59
Johnson, John Allen	59
Johnson (William)	125
Jones, Joseph Charles	47, 50
Kasbohm, Henry Bernard	69

	Page
Kaunitz, Rudolf	69
Keating, Joseph F	73
Kent (Rockwell)	122, 135
Kerensky, Alexander	88
Khrushchev, Nikita S	6, 7, 10, 26, 30, 31–35, 49, 73–75, 92, 93, 95, 97–102, 104, 107, 113, 114
Kimball, Dan	132
King, William	57
Kingissepp, Sergei	103
Kishi, (Nobusuke)	29
Konstantinov, F	10, 18, 29
Kotta, Nuci	95, 97, 98, 113
Kratokvil, Frank M	71
Krchmarek, Anthony	16, 53–55, 113
Lafferty, Travis	59
Lautner, John	133
Lee, Robert E	70, 71
Lehrer, Robert	117
Lenin, V. I	15, 17, 59, 89, 91, 92, 114
Lester, (J. A.)	64, 65
Lima, (Albert) Mickey	78, 79
Lindeberg, Med	103
Loh, Robert	110–112, 114
Longo, Luigi	12
Louie, Stephen K	62
Macomber, William B., Jr	122
Maguire, Michael J	63
Malis, Victor	117
Mandel, William	85, 87
Marcus, Martin Irving	59
Markman, Marvin	45, 46, 48, 50
Marshall, Dorothy (N.)	51
Martin, William H	75
Marzani, (Carl)	21
Marx, Karl	7, 46, 88
McElroy (Neil M.)	134
McGowan, Alan Hugh	45, 48, 49, 50
McMakin, Wilson	72
McPhaul, Arthur	118, 119
Medina, (Harold R.)	23
Melendez Perez, Gertrudis	117
Meyer, Frank S	41
Mierlak, Constant	98, 99, 113
Mignon, Michael	71
Miller (Miss)	16
Minton (Sherman)	130, 131
Mitchell, Bernon F	75
Mulzac, Hugh	69
Momdzhan, K	10, 18, 29
Murray, Tom	132
Murdock, Ray R	66
Morris, Clarence	63
Musgrave, Thomas C., Jr	38
Musil, Charles	53–55, 113
Nakashidse, George	100–102, 113
Nasar, Rusi	98, 99, 113
Negro, John Andrew	58, 79
Nelson (Thomas W.)	65
Nicholas, Elizabeth (M.)	59
Nicolaevsky, B. I	91
O'Connor, Harvey	51, 117
O'Dell, Hunter Pitts	48, 49
Olgin, M. J	19, 22
Ostrin, H. Howard	66
Parker (Lawrence)	64, 65

Page

Paschal, Wayne P. 73
Patten, Jack 85
Pauco, Josoph 95, 96, 113
Penha, Armando 12
Perez Mendez, Cristino 117
Perry, Barbara 46
Peters, Bernard 122
Petkoff, Dimitar K. 100–102, 113
Philbrick, Herbert A. 41–43
Pipa, Arshi 95, 97, 98, 113
Popper, Martin 117
Powers, Francis 33
Pressman, Lee 20
Proctor, Roscoe 78
Prussion, Karl 55–61, 86
Queen, Danny 77
Ransome, Lillian 59
Reed (Stanley) 130, 131
Reeve, Carla 48
Reich, William 56
Remington (William) 21
Rhee, Syngman 13
Richmond, Al 14
Richmond (Alfred C.) 64
Roberson, Mason 13, 14
Roberts, Holland 45
Robertson, J. R. 84
Robeson, Paul 22, 23, 25, 83
Robeson, Paul, Jr. 47, 48, 50
Robinson, Freeman 48
Romerstein, Herbert 44–46, 50
Romppanen, Klaus Samuli Gunnar 103, 104, 114
Rosen, Jacob 45, 48, 49
Rosen, Lottie (Laub) 59
Rosenberg, Julius 122
Ross, Edward 56
Rubin, Mortimer Daniel 77
Ruiz, Frank 117
Russell, Norton Anthony 118
Saez Corales, Juan 117
Samter, Alfred James 117
Santos Rivera, Juan 117
Scheel, Klaus 103
Schenck (Charles T.) 129
Schermatoglu, Ergacsh 98, 99, 113
Schmidt, Henry 84
Schneider, Anita Bell 85
Schneider, Max 46
Secrest, Lee 38
Seeger, Peter (Pete) 51, 117
Shapovalov, Michael 61
Sharp, Dudley C. 37–40
Shepheard, Halert C. 66
Shields, Art 14
Shukeloyts, Anton 98, 100, 113
Silber, Bernard 117
Stalin (Josef) 6, 17, 21, 26, 53, 92, 97, 99, 100, 104
Starkovich (George Tony) 83, 125
Strauss, Leon 24, 25
Sukarno, (Achmed) 111
Sullivan, Elliott 117
Svoboda, (Ludwig) 95
Swan, Charles Malvern 69
Sweet, Sally Attarian 59, 63, 85

Page
Szentendrey, Julius 47
Thompson, Robert 25
Thompson, William Henry 69
Tisler, Frantisek 16, 51–55, 113
Tito (Josip Broz) 31
Townsend, Harold O 73
Trosten, Shea Gorden 67
Truman (Harry S.) 4, 20
Tumash, Vitaut 98, 100, 113
Turoff, Sidney 117
Tyler, Stephen 47
Tyne, George 117
Venger, Ruben 59
Wachter, Douglas 58, 78, 84, 87
Wachter, Saul 58, 63, 79, 84, 85
Wardwell, Loron Whitney 67
Warren (Earl) 135
Watson, Goldie E 118
Weinstone, William 32, 33
Weintraub, Jack 58
Wheeldin, Donald C 118
Wheeler, Juanita 63, 79, 86
Whelan, Joseph G 90
White, Eliot 39
White 119
Whitney (Charlotte Anita) 128, 129
Wiley, Charles 44–47, 50
Wilkinson, Frank 15, 62, 85, 87, 118
Wilson, Elliott 57
Williams, Claude C 39
Williams, Herbert 48
Wine, James W 37–39
Winston, Henry 133
Wolins, Leroy 49
Wong, Harlin 62
Yakobson, Sergius 90
Yates (Oleta O'Connor) 126, 128, 129
Yellin, Edward 118
Young (Philip) 130–132
Zaldastani, Gulvy 100, 101, 113
Zeitz, Louis 59
Zhukov (Georgi K.) 75
Zubek, Theodoric Joseph 95–97, 113

ORGANIZATIONS

AFL–CIO:
Maritime Trades Department:
Seafarers' Section 66
Advance 77
All America Cables & Radio, Inc 72
American Bar Association:
Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives 121, 122
American Cable and Radio Corp 72
American Communications Association, Local 10 117
American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc 66
American Peace Crusade 24
American Student Union 41
American Youth Congress 41
American Youth Festival Organization (AYFO) (Chicago) 46
American Youth for Democracy 42
Antioch College 118
Assembly of Captive European Nations 95, 101
Association of Hungarian Students in North America 47
Austrian Peace Council 46

Page
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute 49
Bulgarian National Committee 101
Byelorussian-American Association 98
Byelorussian Institute Of Arts and Sciences in the United States 98
California Democratic Council, 8th Congressional District 56
Cambridge Youth Council 41
Campbell School (Santa Clara County, Calif.) 59
Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship 49
China, Communist Government 110–112
Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedom (CCPAF) 62, 79, 87
City College of the City of New York 49, 68
Civil Rights Congress 22, 119
Commercial Cable Co 72
Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO 70, 71
Communist Labor Party of America, California 128
Communist Party, Cuba (also known as Popular Socialist Party (PSP) 12
  Eighth National Assembly 11
Communist Party, Czechoslovakia 54
Communist Party, Italy 12
Communist Party, Slovakia 95–97
Communist Party, Soviet Union:
  Politburo 102
  20th Congress, February 1956, Moscow 6, 10
Communist Party, U.S.A. 3–5, 39
  Conferences and Conventions:
    16th National Convention, February 1957, New York City 4, 5, 85
    17th National Convention, December 10–13, 1959, New York City 35, 43, 55, 58, 78, 85, 86
  National Structure:
    National Committee 5, 9, 10, 26, 77
      Executive Committee 60
    Secretariat 11
    Waterfront Section 68
      New Orleans, La 67
      New York City 67
      Port Arthur, Tex 67
  Districts:
    Northern California District 3, 55–64
      District Committee 58, 78, 84–86
      East Bay region:
        Alameda County:
          Hayward area 86
        Political Committee 58, 85
      San Francisco:
        County Committee 84
      Santa Clara County:
        Los Altos-Mountain View cell 55
        Palo Alto Club 55
  States:
    New York:
      State Committee 117
    Ohio 16, 53
Concentration Camps: Slovakia:
  Jachymov 96
  Leopoldov 96
  Muceniky 96
  Novaky 96
  Presov 96
Conference of Studio Unions 20
CONELRAD System (CONtrol of ELectromagnetic RADiation) 70
Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) 20, 21

	Page
Cornell University	118
Cuban Popular Socialist Party (PSP) (*See* Communist Party, Cuba.)	
Czechoslovak Foreign Institute	54
Czechoslovakia, Government of:	
Embassy, Washington, D.C	16, 52, 54
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	52
Ministry of Interior	52
Ministry of National Defense:	
Military Intelligence Directorate	52, 53
Democratic Party, California	56
South Palo Alto Democratic Club	56, 60
Stanford Democratic Club	56
East Bay Community Forum (EBCF)	79
Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, United	118
Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC)	51, 62, 69
Engineer and Research Corp	134
Fund for the Republic	27
Fur and Leather Workers Union of the United States and Canada, International	25
Georgian National Alliance	101
Globe Wireless, Ltd	72
Harlem Youth Congress	48–51
Independent Progressive Party (California) (*See* Progressive Party, California)	56
International I	88
International II, 1907 Congress	88
International III (Comintern)	20, 88
International Labor Defense	124
International Union of Students (IUS)	44
International Preparatory Committee	45
International Workers of the World	129
Jefferson School of Social Science	67
Komsomol. (*See* Young Communist League, Soviet Union.)	
Latin American Youth Congress, Havana, August 1960	11
Lenin University (Moscow)	89
Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, International	84
Longshoremen's Association, International:	
Local 829 (Baltimore)	67
Lower Harlem Tenants Council	49
Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co	72
Maritime Union, National	66, 67
Martha Washington Public School (Philadelphia, Pa.)	118
Mutual Broadcasting System Inc	73
National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council	66
National Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee	62
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A	37–40
General Board	40
National Industry Advisory Committee (NIAC)	73
National Labor Conference for Peace (*see also* New York Labor Conference for Peace)	24
Nature Friends of America	130
New York Labor Conference for Peace (*see also* National Labor Conference for Peace)	24
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)	97, 108
Palo Alto Peace Club	56
Peace Information Center	25
People's Institute of Applied Religion	40
Pioneers	75
Popular Socialist (Communist) Party, Cuba. (*See* Communist Party, Cuba.)	
Progressive Party, California (Independent Progressive Party)	56
RCA Communications, Inc	117
Russian Social Democratic Labor Party	88, 91
San Francisco State College	78

Page
Santa Rosa Junior College 78
Seafarers' International Union of North America 66
Seamen's Defense Committee Against Coast Guard Screening (also known as Seamen's Defense Committee) 69
Slovak Democratic Party 95
Slovak National Council Abroad 95
Stanford University 59, 60
Political Forum 60
Tata Institute of Fundamental Research 122
Uglich Labor Camp 105
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Government of:
Defense (War), Ministry of:
Navy:
Naval intelligence 74
Secret Police:
MVD (Ministry of International Affairs (Ministerstvo Vnutryennik Del)) 104–106
Union Theological Seminary 40
United Nations 34
Czechoslovakian Mission 52
India Mission 50
United States Government:
Air Force, Department of the 37–40, 70, 72
Air Training Command 37
Continental Air Command 37
Central Intelligence Agency 28
Commission on Government Security (Wright Commisssion) 132
Department of Defense 37, 133–136
Department of Justice:
Federal Bureau of Investigation 5, 62
Department of State 122, 133, 136
Federal Communications Commission 70–73
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of 130
House of Representatives:
Committee on Un-American Activities 78
Senate:
Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee 78
National Security Agency 75
Supreme Court 27, 64, 83, 122, 126–132, 134, 135
Treasury Department
Coast Guard 64, 65, 69
Office of Merchant Marine Safety 66
Customs, Bureau of 44, 61, 62
University of California 58, 78, 86
Vernay Laboratories 118
Vorkuta Labor Camps 104–106
Washington Video Productions, Inc 64, 83
Western Union Telegraph Co 117
World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) 44, 45
World Youth Festival (*see also* American Youth Festival Organization (AYFO)):
Sixth Youth Festival, July 28 to August 11, 1957, Moscow 47, 49
Seventh Youth Festival, July 26 to August 4, 1959, Vienna 30, 45–47, 49–51
United States Festival Committee (New York) 45, 46, 49, 50
YMCA 42
Young Communist League 41
Young Communist League, Soviet Union (Komsomol) 75
Youth Against the House Un-American Activities Committee 15, 30, 50, 51, 68
Youth to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee 15
Youth to Abolish Un-American Committees 15

PUBLICATIONS

	Page
Air Force Manual 205–5. (*See* Guide for Security Indoctrination.)	
Air Reserve Center Training Manual	37–40
Catholic Action (Slovakia)	96
CIO News	20
Daily Californian (University of California publication)	86, 87
Declaration of the 12 Communist Parties (also known as Declaration of Communist and Workers Parties of Socialist Countries)	10
Fight for Fredom—A Pictorial Exhibit	103
Flashlight, The	56
From Blackmail to Blackjack (leaflet)	81
Guide for Security Indoctrination, AF Manual 205–5	39, 40
International Affairs	28
Kommunist	10
New Horizons	77
Nova Doba	53, 55
Operation Abolition (film)	83, 84
People's World (Formerly Daily People's World)	81, 118
Political Affairs	9–11
Soviet Union (book)	61
Statement issued by the Conference of Representatives of 81 Communist Parties, Moscow, December 1960	8, 33
Strike Strategy	18
Under Arrest—Workers' Self-Defense in the Courts (pamphlet)	124
Why Communism?	19
World Marxist Review	28

○